Government to respond. We cannot force them to respond. I have said that the sense of the House is that the Home Minister should reply. He will take it up with the appropriate people and then they will respond.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: We are sending word.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Now, we will take up the short-duration discussion. Initiating the discussion is Prof. V.K. Malhotra.

SHORT-DURATION DISCUSSION

Need for Review of foreign Policy

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दिल्ली): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत की विदेश नीति से भारत की स्थिति आज अत्यंत दयनीय है। ग्लोबल अफेयर्स में हम पूरी तरह से मार्जिनाइज्ड हो गए हैं, दुनिया में हम अलग-थलग पड़ गए हैं, अकेले पड़ गए हैं। संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ की सुरक्षा परिषद की स्थायी सीट के लिए हमारी शर्मनाक हार ने सिद्ध कर दिया है कि दुनिया की दृष्टि में हमारा कोई अस्तित्व नहीं है। हमारा अपमान हो रहा है। हमें धमकियां दी जा रही है। हमें ऐसा दिखाई दे रहा है जैसे कि दुनिया की सारी कम्युनिटी में हम कोई अनाथ हों। इस दुर्दशा के लिए सारी जिम्मेदारी मैं इस सरकार पर तो नहीं डालना चाहता क्योंकि बहुत कुछ पाप की भागीदार इससे पहले की सरकार भी है और काफी देर से यह स्थिति इस तरह से बिगड़ती चली आ रही है। परंतु अपने लायक दोस्त गुजराल साहब से यह उम्मीद थी क्योंकि वे बहुत पुराने, विदेश नीति के कुशल हैं और उनसे यह आशा थी कि यहां पर आने के बाद वे इसको पटरी पर वापस लाएंगे और कुछ ऐसे कदम उठाएंगे कि... और कुछ ऐसे कदम उठायेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान का अस्तित्व ही दुनिया की नज़रों में दिखायी देने लगे। परन्तु दुर्भाग्य है कि कुछ तो इस नई सरकार की नीतियों के कारण, और कुछ ऐसी गलतियों के कारण स्थिति पहले से भी ज्यादा बिगड़ी है। मैं यद्यपि बहुत से दूसरे सवाल है पर सब से पहले उस सवाल को लेना चाहता हूं कि सरकार जिसे एक ऐतिहासिक समझौता कह कर ढिंढोरा पीट रही है, चीन के राष्ट्रपति हिन्दुस्तान में आए और यह कहा जा रहा है कि उनके साथ एक बड़ा ऐतिहासिक समझौता हुआ है, प्रधान मंत्री ने, हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने इसका बहुत बड़ा श्रेय लेने की कोशिश की है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, चीन के साथ समझौता हो और शांति बनी रहे, हर आदमी यह चाहेगा। परन्तु इस समझौते में ऐतिहासिक क्या है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। क्या ऐतिहासिक यह है कि चीन के राष्ट्रपति पहली बार हिन्दुस्तान में आए, क्या केवल ऐतिहासिकता इसमें है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने सारे प्रोटोकोल तोड़ करके उनकी अगवानी की और उनको छोड़ने गए? क्या यह ऐतिहासिक है कि मादक द्रव्य पदार्थों की तस्करी रोकी जाए?

क्या ऐतिहासिक समझौता यह है कि हांगकांग के अंदर, जब 1997 में वह चीन का हिस्सा बन जाए, तो हम अपना कौंसलेट वहां पर खोलें? हमारे साथ चीन के सवाल जो जुड़े हुए हैं उन सवालों का क्या हुआ? क्या चीन के राष्ट्रपति हिन्दुस्तान में आए और उन्होंने आ करके जो हजारों किलोमीटर जमीन हमारी उन्होंने छीन रखी है और छीन करके कब्जा करके अपने पास रखी है उसके बारे में समझौते में क्या हुआ? क्या वह इसका समझौता करने आए थे कि उनके बारे में कोई बातचीत की जाए कि वह धरती हमें कब वापस दी जाएगी, किस रूप में वापस की जाएगी या हमने उस सवाल को कोई जोर से उनके साथ उठाया है कि यह हमारी धरती आपके कब्जे में है इसको आप कब वापस करने वाले हैं? क्या हमने तिब्बत के अन्दर होने वाला दमन, तिब्बत के अन्दर होने वाले मानवाधिकारों का हनन, वहां पर तिब्बती शरणार्थी जो हिन्दुस्तान में बैठे हुए हैं उनके वापस जाने की बात क्या वहां के राष्ट्रपति ने हमसे की या हमने उनके साथ की? अगर उन्होंने नहीं की तो हमने उन तिब्बती शरणार्थियों को वापस भेजने के लिए वहां वातावरण बने और वहां जो आज मानवाधिकारों का हनन हो रहा है क्या उसके बारे में कोई समझौता उनके साथ हुआ है या कोई उसके बारे में बातचीत हुई है? पाकिस्तान को जो एटमी हथियार चीन दे रहा है जो एम-11 मिसाइल दे रहा है, जो बंगलादेश के अंदर अपना नौसैनिक अड्डा बना रहा है, जो बर्मा को वह हथियार दे रहा है, बंगलादेश को वह हथियार दे रहा है, हिन्दुस्तान की सुरक्षा को खतरे में डाल रहा है उसके बारे में आपका उससे क्या समझौता हुआ है? क्या आपने उनसे कोई बातचीत की या आपने उनसे कहा है कि यह पाकिस्तान के साथ किस तरह का व्यवहार कर रहे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के साथ यह दुश्मनी की बातें क्यों की जा रही हैं, उनके साथ ये सवाल कितने जोर से आपने उठाए या उन्होंने उसके बारे में क्या कंसीड आपको किया? पाकिस्तान को एटमी हथियार, पाकिस्तान को दूसरे हथियार, हमारे कश्मीर के अंदर अपनी सड़क बना लेना, लद्दाख के अंदर हजारों किलोमीटर की जमीन, 33 हजार किलोमीटर

की जमीन ले लेना, अक्साईचिन के ऊपर कब्जा कर लेना, वहां पर सिक्किम को हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा मानना ही नहीं, ये सवाल हैं जो हमारे साथ जुड़े हुए हैं। उनके साथ क्या ऐतिहासिक समझौता आपका हुआ मैं जरूर इसके बारे में जानना चाहता हूं? उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कहा गया कि हमारे सेनाएं पीछे हट जायेंगी। विदेश मंत्री जी, सेनाएं पीछे हट जायेंगी यह आपने उनसे समझौता किया है। परन्तु यह समझौता करते हुए क्या आपने सुरक्षा की बात को देखा है चीन पीछे हटने के बाद भी हिनदुस्तान की जमीन में रहेगा और हिन्दुस्तान अपनी धरती में और पीछे हट जायेगा। चीन पठार पर बैठा है जिस दिन वापस आना चाहेगा उस दिन वापस आ जाएगा और घंटों के अंदर वहां पहुंच जाएगा और हम जितना पीछे हटेंगे उसके बाद उस पहाड़ी दुर्गम क्षेत्र में जाने के लिए हमें बहुत समय लगेगा, बहुत बड़ी कठिनाई पैदा होगी। सारे डिफेंस एक्सपर्ट यह कह रहे हैं कि यह सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से घातक होगा। क्या आपने इसका विचार किया है? मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि चीन जो चाहता था वह इस समझौते में हमसे ले जाए और केवल शांति के नाम पर, पंचशील के नाम पर, इन सब चीजों के नाम पर हम उनसे समझौता करते हुए जो मुद्दे हैं उनको उनके सामने पूरी तरह से न रखें, मैं इसके अंदर ऐतिहासिक समझौता करके कोई बड़ी भारी शानदार कामयाबी आपने हासिल की है मैं इसके बारे में आपको कोई बधाई नहीं दे सकता हूं।

विदेश मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे जरूर कहना चाहता हूं चीनी भाई-भाई का नारा लगाने से पहले और उनको राखी बांधने से पहले उस बात को याद रखिएगा। 15 नवम्बर, 1962 को संसद के अंदर जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी ने जो यहां रेजोल्यूशन पास किया था, सारे देश ने जो एक प्रतिज्ञा की थी, उस के ये शब्द हैं:

> "With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India however long and hard the struggle may be."

महोदय, आज वहां की धरती को पूरी तरह से उन के हाथ में दे देना और अपनी जमीन से भी पीछे हटने की बात करना और चीन का अपनी धरती मैकमोहन लाइन से पीछे न हटने की बात करना, यह समझौता कोई भारत के स्वाभिमान के लिए अच्छा समझौता है? मैं समझता हूं कि यह बात सही नहीं है।

दूसरी बात, विदेश मंत्री जी जो मैं आप से कहना चाहता था, वह यह है कि सुरक्षा परिषद् की सीट के लिए जो हमारी शर्मनाक हार हुई है, उस से हमारा सिर शर्म से दुनिया के सामने झुक गया है। जहां जापान को 142 वोट मिलते हैं, भारत को सिर्फ 40 वोट मिलते हैं और सेकंड वोट की भी जरूरत नहीं पड़ती है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मैं मान सकता हूं कि यह फैसला पिछली सरकार ने किया था कि यह सीट लड़ी जाय और फिर आप के लिए शर्म से विदड्डा करना मुश्किल होता, परंतु गुजराल जी क्या यह बात ठीक नहीं है कि चुनाव से एक दिन पहले तक इस बात का दावा किया जा रहा था कि हम जीत रहे हैं? इस के लिए हिंदुस्तान के अखबारों में और दुनिया में बयान दिए जा रहे थे। यह दुनिया को दिखाने के लिए तो ठीक है, परंतु इतना गलत अंदाजा कि आप को सिर्फ 40 वोट मिलते हैं और हम कहते हैं कि हम जीत रहे हैं, हमारी विक्टरी श्योर है, हम ने 137 देशों में अपने दूत भेजे हैं और उन से बातचीत की है व सारे देश हमारा साथ देने के लिए तैयार हैं। यह गलती कैसे हुई? आप को अंदाजा क्यों नहीं हुआ कि हम हार रहे हैं, पराजित हो रहे हैं और अगर विदड्डा भी नहीं करना था तो यह बात तो कही जा सकती थी कि हम अपने सिद्धांतों पर चुनाव लड़ रहे हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, उस के बाद ऐसा कहा जा रहा है कि सी०टी०बी०टी० पर साइन नहीं किए। यह कहा जा रहा है कि काश्मीर के सवाल पर पाकिस्तान ने मुस्लिम देशों को इकट्ठा कर लिया है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि जापान के पास बड़ी इकॉनोमिक पावर है। उस के पास बड़े डॉलर्स हैं और यह डॉलर की जीत है। महोदय, क्या यह सवाल हमें पहले मालूम नहीं थे? क्या हमें मालूम नहीं था कि सी०टी०बी०टी० पर अमेरिका और उस के साथी देश हमारे साथ नाराज हो सकते हैं? क्या हमें मालूम नहीं था कि काश्मीर के बारे में पाकिस्तान मुस्लिम देशों में प्रचार कर रहा है? उस के बावजूद भी हमें कुछ मुस्लिम देशों के वोट मिले हैं। महोदय, मैं उसे एक अच्छा लक्षण मानता हूं। परंतु अधिकांश देशों ने हमें वोट नहीं दिए। फिर "नैम" देशों का क्या हुआ? उन के वोट हमें क्यों नहीं मिले? विकासशील देशों के वोट हमें क्यों नहीं मिले? नॉन-एलाइंस मूवमेंट जिसकी लीडरशीप का दावा हम करते रहे हैं, उन के वोटों की संख्या के एक-तिहाई, एक-चौथाई वोट हमें नहीं मिले। विकासशील देशों के वोट हमारे हाथ से कैसे चले गए? उन के साथ हमारे संबंध कैसे बिगड़ गए? क्या हमारा यह कहना है कि वह सब वोट खरीद लिए गए? जापान उन को खरीद कर ले गया। मैं समझता हूं कि इस तरह का बहाना ढूंढना बिल्कुल बेमानी है! महोदय, यह हमारी

बहुत बड़ी हार हुई है। हम पूरी तरह से इस सवाल को उन के सामने नहीं ले जा सके। इस सवाल को उनके सामने खड़ा नहीं कर सके और उस के बाद जो बात कही गयी, जो सम-अप किया गया, वह इसी लाइन पर है कि:

> "India lost Security Council votes so badly because in the post cold-war period New Delhi is an orphan within the world community and does not belong anywhere."

आज आप के साथ दुनिया में कौन खड़ा है, इस बारे में आप की स्थिति स्पष्ट नहीं है और उस के लिए कोई विशेष प्रयास नहीं किए गए हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, तीसरी बात मैं आप के सामने रखना चाहूंगा। अब सारे सवाल तो मैं अभी नहीं उठा सकता, परंतु आज अफगानिस्तान के बारे में जो स्थिति है वह मैं जरूर उठाना चाहता हूं। अफगानिस्तान में यह पहली बार हुआ है कि भारत का कोई रोल ही नहीं है।

ऐसा तो पहले कभी नहीं हुआ। यह जग-जाहिर है कि तालिबान की मदद पाकिस्तान कर रहा है जग-जाहिर है कि अमेरिका पाकिस्तान की पुश्त पर खड़ा है और तीन-चौथाई अफगानिस्तान पर तालिबान का कब्जा हो गया है। महोदय, तालिबान ने जिस तरह से वहां पर मानवाधिकारों का हनन किया है, जिस तरह से वहां के पूर्व राष्ट्रपति को फांसी पर चढ़ाया जाता है, जिस प्रकार से उस ने महिलाओं पर अत्याचार किए हैं, भारतीय मूल के लोगों को तालिबान ने जिस तरह से वहां से मार-मारकर भगाया है, वहां के मुसलमानों के खिलाफ अत्याचार किए हैं पाकिस्तान के बाद, वह हमारे लिए रोंगटे खड़े कर देने वाला है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान की हमारी उसके अंदर क्या भूमिका है? लगातार वहां पर यह सब कुछ होता रहा। हिन्दुस्तान की वहां पर जो एक बहुत बड़ी स्थिति थी कि बिना हिन्दुस्तान से पूछे हुए वहां का कोई मामला हल नहीं होता था, आज हमारा उसके अंदर कोई पार्ट नहीं रहा। अमरीका वहां पर इस तरह की स्थिति करता जा रहा है। अमरीका आज पूरी तरह से बेनकाब हुआ है। अमरीका कहता है कि वह मानवाधिकारों का संरक्षक है, परन्तु क्या यह मानवाधिकारों का संरक्षण है कि महिलाओं के लिए स्कूल बंद हैं, कालेज बंद हैं, आफिसेज में नहीं जा सकती, बुर्का पहने बिना निकल नहीं सकती? मानवाधिकारों के ऐसे हनन के बाद भी अमरीका चुप बैठा है और वहां पर उनको शह दिए चला जा रहा है।

महोदय, इसी तरह उसके बोर्डर पर कश्मीर में ले जाने के लिए तालिबां प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र लगा रहे हैं। प्रशिक्षण कैम्प लगाए जा रहे हैं, वहां पर ट्रेनिंग दी जा रही है, इस्लामिक फंडामेंटलिज्म का केन्द्र बन गया है, सब दुनियां से मर्सनरीस वहां इकट्ठा हो रही हैं, उनको कश्मीर में भेजने के लिए उनके पूरे आंकड़े हैं, नाम है, सब कुछ है। अमरीका जो टेरोरिज्म के खिलाफ बड़ा दावा करता है, उसके खिलाफ बड़ा दावा करता है, उसके खिलाफ आपने क्या आवाज उठाई, क्या किया? आप उसके बारे में हाथ पर हाथ धरे बैठे हैं। एक भी स्टेटमेंट आपका नहीं है, एक बात भी नहीं है, कुछ नहीं है, कोई चीज करने के लिए आप तैयार नहीं है। मैं समझता हूं कि एक बहुत बड़ी दूसरी भूल इस बारे में हुई है।

महोदय, एक और सवाल है। पाकिस्तान का सवाल हमारे सामने खड़ा हुआ है। आज पाकिस्तान का आई०एस०आई० क्या कर रहा है? हिन्दुस्तान में अनडिकलेयर वार है, कश्मीर के अंदर 15,000 से ज्यादा लोग पाकिस्तान के एजेंटों ने मार डाले लाखों लोग वहां से निकाल दिए। अब वहां पर जैसे-तैसे चुनाव हुए, लेकिन चुनाव के बाद भी लोग मारे जा रहे हैं। सैकड़ों लोग उसके बाद मारे गए हैं, वहां पर सेना पर हमले हो रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान हिन्दुस्तान में अपने नोटों का चलन कर रहा है, पाकिस्तान ने नार्थ-ईस्ट में आई० एस० आई० का अड्डा बना दिया, टेरोरिज्म और सेपटेरिज्म को बढ़ावा दे रहा है, पाकिस्तान वहां पर लोगों को प्रशिक्षण दे रहा है। पाकिस्तान द्वारा यह सब कुछ करने के बाद भी आप पाकिस्तान के बारे में मौन हैं, चुप हैं। पाकिस्तान में अभी जो कांड हुआ, उस कांड में हमारे हाई-कमीशन के अधिकारी ऐ०के० वाही के घर के अंदर-छज्जे से कूदकर वहां पर पाकिस्तान के आई०एस०आई० के लोग घुस गए, उन्हे पीटकर अधमरा कर दिया, उसकी पत्नी को चाकू घोप दिया और उस कांड पर कोई रिएक्शन नहीं, कुछ नहीं। दिल्ली में पाकिस्तान हाई-कमीशन जासूसी का अड्डा है। हर कुछ देर के बाद उनका एक आदमी पकड़ा जाता है। उनके पकड़े जाने के बाद, हमारा हाई-कमीशन जो वहां पर है, उसके सारे एम्पलाईज कांपने लगते हैं कि अब इसका रिएक्शन जरूर वहां पर होगा, अब हमें पीटा जाएगा, अब हमें मारा जाएगा। विदेशमंत्री जी क्या बात है कि आज पाकिस्तान के हाई-कमीशन में काम करने के लिए कोई आफीसर तैयार नहीं होता? आप उनसे सुनिए, जो पाकिस्तान में हाई-कमीशन में काम कर चुके हैं। वह

रोंगटे खड़ी कर देने वाली बातें बताते हैं। वह बताते हैं कि घर से निकल नहीं सकते, बाहर जा नहीं सकते, स्कूल में जा नहीं सकते, किसी से मिल नहीं सकते, किसी से बातचीत कर नहीं सकते क्योंकि हर वक्त उनके पीछे कोई न कोई आई०एस०आई० के आदमी लगे रहते हैं। उनको पीटा जाता है, अपमानित किया जाता है, दुर्दशा की जाती है। उनको मालूम है कि सब कर लेने के बाद भी इतना वहशियाना, इतना भंयकर, पाशविक कार्य करने के बाद भी हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार का कोई रोंग रिएक्शन होने वाला नहीं है और क्योंकि स्ट्रोंग रिएक्शन नहीं होने वाला इसलिए वह समझते हैं कि यहां की सरकार नपुंसक सरकार है, उनके खिलाफ कोई कदम नहीं उठाएगी। इसलिए बहुत आराम से वह इस बात को करते चले जाते हैं।

मैंने जब यह पढ़ा तो मुझे बहुत दुख हुआ। मैंने यह हैडलाइन पढ़ा अखबार में—"The soft Pak policy of United Front Government angers MEA officials".

सरकार की यह पाक सोफ्ट पालिसी, और उसके आगे यह पालिसी क्या बनाई है—"Under the new Pakistan policy New Delhi has refrained from responding to anti-Indian statements by Pakistan leaders of the Foreign Ministry."

कोई भी वहां पर बयान देता रहे, युनाइटेड फ्रंट सरकार ने यह नीति बना ली है और कह दिया है कि हम अपने पड़ौसियों से बड़े अच्छे समझौते करेंगे, उनके रिलेशन बढ़ाएंगे। हिन्दुस्तान में कहीं कोई रिएक्शन न हो जाए, हम उसको सही तस्वीर बताने को तैयार नहीं। वह कोई भी स्टेटमेंट कर दे, उसके बारे में चुप रहने को मजबूर हैं, उसके बारे में कोई बात नहीं करना चाहते हैं। आपने पाकिस्तान को एक टैरिस्ट कंट्री डिकलेअर करने के लिए दुनिया में क्या कदम उठाए हैं? पाकिस्तान से बड़ा कोई टैरिस्ट मुल्क इस वक्त नहीं है। आपने दुनिया में, अमेरिका में, यू०एन०ओ० में, दुसरे यूरोपीय देशों में, दूसरे देशों में जाकर इसके खिलाफ आवाज क्यों नहीं उठाई? जिस तरह से उन्होंने कश्मीर में अपहरण किए हैं, बलात्कार किए हैं, उनकी तस्वीरें क्यों नहीं दिखाई? इसलिए नहीं दिखाई क्योंकि आपका झूठा सैक्युलरिज़म आड़े आ जाता है। आपको लगता है कि अगर हम दुनिया में यह दिखाएंगे कि पाकिस्तान क्या कर रहा है तो हिन्दुस्तान में कहीं उसका रिएक्शन न हो, बाहर रिएक्शन न हो, कोई आपको यह न कहे कि एंटी मुस्लिम पॉलिसी आप अख्तियार कर रहे हैं। पाकिस्तान और मुस्लिम, ये दोनों एक साथ की चीज़ें नहीं है। पाकिस्तान का विरोध करना, यह आपके लिए कोई ऐसी बात नहीं जिसको कि आपको इस रूप में नहीं लेना चाहिए था। क्या यह हिन्दुस्तान के हितों के साथ खिलवाड़ नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान की इन सारी बातों को भी आप आराम से टॉलरेट किए जा रहें हैं, आराम से देखे जा रहे हैं? और इस नई पॉलिसी के अंदर क्योंकि इससे कहीं अपने वोट बैंक पर असर न पड़ जाए, इसलिए इस विदेश नीति के नाम पर आपने हिन्दुस्तान के राष्ट्रीय हितों से यह खिलवाड़ किया है कि यह राष्ट्रीय हितों के अंदर चीज नहीं आती।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Kindly conclude.

There is another Member from your party who has to speak.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: I will take three to four minutes उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, फरक्का के पानी के बारे में अब मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। मुझे समझ में नहीं आया कि फरक्का का समझौता करने बंगला देश में ज्योति बसु किस नाते से गए हैं? What is his *locus standi?* क्या ताल्लुक है इनका? क्या विदेश मंत्री इतने अयोग्य हैं? जाएं, हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री जाएं, विदेश मंत्री जाएं, जल संसाधन मंत्री जाएं, कोई केबिनेट मिनिस्टर जाएं, ज्योति बसु का वहां जाने का क्या मतलब है? ज्योति बसु हिन्दुस्तान के क्या, कौन से, किस पद पर हैं, जिसके नाते वे बंगला देश से समझौता करने गए हैं? बंगला देश से समझौता किसी एक मुख्य मंत्री का काम नहीं है और वहां पर जाना, फरक्का के बारे में समझौता करना और उसके जल का पानी इतना उनको दे देना इसलिए कि बंगला देश के साथ केवल हमारे ताल्लुक सुधर जाएं, चाहे बंगाल तबाह हो जाए, चाहे बंगाल का किसान मर जाए, चाहे उसकी खेती उजड़ जाए, चाहे बंगाल में कितना भी ऐजीटेशन हो। समझौता करने से पहले इसका विचार कीजिए, अपने राष्ट्रीय हितों का विचार कीजिए और इन राष्ट्रीय हितों का विचार किए बिना फरक्का समझौता करना और ज्योति बसु को वहां पर भेजकर के केवल मात्र अपने युनाइटेड फ्रंट की पॉलिसी को लगाना, मैं समझता हूं कि यह ठीक नहीं बैठेगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अंत में यह बात कहना चाहता हूं कि आज हालात बदल गए है, पोल्स बदल गए है, दुनिया बदल गई है और दुनिया बाई-पोलर नहीं रही है, यूनी-पोलर हो रही है और ये सारी परिस्थितियां बदल गई हैं, हालात बदल गए हैं, कोल्ड वार खत्म हो

गई है, जो नान एलाइन्मेंट मूवमेंट थी वह खत्म हो गई है और हम अभी तक चिपके बैठे हैं नेहरू पॉलिसी से, पॉलिसी जो उस समय बनाई गई थी, उन हालात में बनाई गई थी, तब ठीक थी, हम उसी के साथ आज जुड़े बैठे हैं और उसी के कारण से न हमारा कोई इनीशयेटिव है और चाहे चाइना हो, चाहे पाकिस्तान हो, अमेरिका हो, चाहे इकॉनमिक मामले हों, चाहे किसी और दूसरे मामले में भी, जिस तरह से वे धमकियां दिए जा रहे हैं उन सारी बातों को देखते हुए मैं आपसे गुजारिश करना चाहता हूं कि इस विदेश नीति से, आर्थिक नीति से हम गुलाम हो रहे हैं। मल्टी नेशनल कम्पनियां हमारे ऊपर हैं, सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से हम बर्बाद हो रहे हैं, सुरक्षा मंत्री के पास कोई टाइम नहीं है और विदेश नीति के कारण हम दुनिया में पूरी तरह से अलग-थलग पड़ गए हैं। अगर यही स्थिति बनी रही तो जो थोड़ा-बहुत अस्तित्व है, वह भी मिट जाएगा। मैं आपसे आशा करता हूं कि आप इसके बारे में कोई ऐसे कदम उठाएं जिनसे हम फिर से उस स्थिति में पहुंच सकें।

आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया, उसके लिए बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank my parliamentary colleagues for raising this discussion, particularly the initiator of the discussion, that we should have a look at the policy pursued by the Government in respect of our external relations. By my appreciation stops there. On most of the issues I do not agree with his views. Firstly, I would like to put the records straight. The visit of His Excellency, the President of China, was a unique opportunity to strengthen our relationship with China. The agreement which has been signed with the objective of reducing forces on the borders is the most appropriate and correct step which has been taken at this juncture. In 1993, when the treaty of peace and tranquillity on the border was signed, many were sceptical whether it would be possible to diffuse the tension on the border. Fortunately, with hard work initiated by the joint working goup and experts' group it was possible last year to organise withdrawal of the forces which were placed in an eye-ball position leading to tensions off and on. These agreements of reduction of forces is one step forward towards normalisation of relations with China. I do agree with the hon. Member when we say that the world is changing very fast and when we say that the world is changing very fast we shall have to recognise that our thought process and our action should also change fast. We cannot live in the mind-set of the past and deal with a situation of the present and look forward to the future. Therefore, what happened in 1959 and 1962 has no doubt relevance but at the same time, those relevances have to be reviewed in the context of the changing world. So far as India's foreign policy is concerned and as we are all aware, there is a broad consensus and that broad consensus was to maintain the national interest and also to ensure that we build up good neighbourly relations with our neighbours and friendly relations with all others. At the same time, at the time of formulation of our policies just at the end of the World War when the whole world was divided into two groups and the world had to live under the spell of the cold war for almost half a century, it was most appropriate to evolve the policy of non-alignment which was strengthened, which become a very powerful movement. But at the same time, particularly from the mid 80s, certain things have taken place which we cannot simply ignore. It is not a theoritical proposition but it has a practical reflection. As far as we are concerned, particularly as far as India is concerned, with the collapse of the Soviet system, it has altered the external relations, both economically and politically to a considerable extent. Any student of history cannot ignore this fact. Up to 1988-89, the single largest trading partner of India was Soviet Russia. Nearly 28 per cent of our external trade was accounted for towards that country. We were assured of the supply of our defence requirements to a considerable extent on rupee account. Today, those facilities are not simply available. There is no reason

why we should lament and worry and live in the past. We shall have to adjust our policies and programmes with a new relative which we have done, which we have done through the new agreement which was signed with the Russian Federation after the visit of H.E. President Yeltsin. It is also providing a new opportunity where our volume of trade is expanding, economic cooperation is expanding and the recently concluded defence agreements are also providing strength to our system. Therefore, the policy has to be adjusted with the changing scenario. We cannot live in the past and at the same time look to the future. Certain things have been suggested and particularly, I would like to touch upon one point because I have also a small role therein and this issue has been raised particularly in one of the Consultative Committee meetings connected with External Affairs Ministry where it was pointed out that I insisted on India's contesting for the non-permanent seat in the Security Council. Yes, I did. I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister on the first of August, 96. I do not disown my responsibility. A decision was taken to contest for the non-permanent seat in 1994. In 1995, when I was the Foreign Minister, we started a campaign and we got some good response. On the basis of that, we decided to contest for the non-permanent seat. I mentioned in my letters of 1st August to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister that I had the privilege of having a discussion with the Special Envoy from Japan. Both of us recognised that it had a bearing so far as the permanent membership in the Security Council was also concerned. We also recognised that it would be desirable to have a seat in the Security Council. From our point of view, when we started reviving the democratic process in Kashmir and when there was a persistent obstruction to our efforts from the other side of the border, it was considered desirable that India should have its presence in the Security Council. Apart from the other considerations, one of the most important, vital considerations is that two seats from the Asian region are represented by the countries of the same region—one seat is occupied by Korea and the second one which was vacated by Indonesia is going to be occupied by Japan from 1997. These two countries belong to the same region. Therefore, our argument was that we should have representation from the South Asia and there was nothing wrong in it. I would like to have one clarification from the Foreign Minister. So far as the stand which we took on CTBT is concerned, it is not merely the stand of the Foreign Minister of the United Front Government alone. It is a stand taken by the whole House. Mr. Gujral came to this House several times with his *suo motu* statements and we endorsed all his statements. We congratulated him on the principled stand which he took. At this stage, I would like to have one clarification from him. There was a problem in regard to the transmission of the treaty from Geneva to New York. I was told that the countries, sixty or sixty-one, which participated in the Conference on Disarmament indicated that they appreciated India's position—that India could not be a signatory to the CTBT. But some countries, after spending two-and-a-half years in the Conference on Disarmament, wanted to transmit the treaty in some form or the other to the General Assembly because it could not be a document of the Conference on Disarmament. Therefore, they wanted to transmit the outcome of their efforts consumed in the last two-and-a-half years. There we had to apply our veto power. I am not objecting to Inida's veto. But what I am trying to find out from the Minister of External Affairs is that whether, after that decision, we had undertaken a vigorous briefing of those sixty-one countries as to why we had to take this step and this aspect has some relevance.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, as you will recollect, today is an important day

because in 1971, 25 years ago, on this very day we had to participate in the liberation struggle of Bangladesh. But after the war was won, the Foreign Ministry had launched a very vigorous briefing with only one point. That point was to tell the international community that India was not an aggressor. India had to involve itself in this not only to protect the human rights of the 75 million people of East Pakistan, now Bangladesh, but also because the developments on the border put a tremendous strain on India's economy. About ten million refugees took shelter in India. That vigorous briefing in the post-war scenario explained India's position. I would like to know whether we undertook such a briefing in the present case. It is because if I was a participant in the Conference and if the Conference ended in nothing, my two-and-a-half years' efforts would go waste because technically India had the power of veto. India did exercise this power and did it on the basis of its principled stand. I would like to know whether we had explained our principled stand to the participating countries in the Conference on Disarmament. This is one of the points that I would like to know from the hon. External Affairs Minister. I can assure him that I do stand by my letter and I do feel that it was necessary for us to contest. Whether we would have got 40 votes or 30 votes or 60 votes, is a different story. Perhaps we could have won, perhaps not; I do not know. It has happened many times in the international scene. When we took a stand on the NPT, almost all the Non-aligned countries were participants in the NPT and we were not. The same is the story with the CTBT. Therefore, in these two major areas, the NPT and CTBT, we shall have to redefine the role of the Non-aligned Movement. One attempt at redefinitioin has been made at the Jakarta Summit. Thereafter, it was reiterated in the Cartegana message. To my mind, the South-South Cooperation and cooperation amongst the developing countries is not enough.

I now come to the question of our relations with the neighbouring countries. In general, I agree with the Foreign Minister's approach as he has said while delivering his speech on 'Foreign Policy Objectives of India's United Front Government' at Chetham house on September 23. I quote, "With this logo, we have started reshaping India's relations with its neighbours. For four months, the Indian Government has not reacted to any blast or blister thrown at it from a not-so-friendly neighbour". I do agree that you are not to throw a blast or a blister. But sometimes proper response at the appropriate time is necessary. I don't want you to throw a blast or a blister. I do not even expect reciprocity in regard to our neighbouring countries. I entirely agree with you when you have outlined that you don't expect reciprocity from Nepal, Bangladesh, Maldives, Sri Lanka and Bhutan. In fact, this is our policy. We have never expected reciprocity from them. When Mr. Chidambaram as the then Commerce Minister reduced tarrif duty to zero on 15 items, we didn't do so with the expectation of reciprocity. Or, when Mr. Manmohan Singh abolished the import duty on Bangladeshi sarees, he did not consider much as to how the Indian weavers, the Coimbatore and Kanjivaram saree manufacturers would respond to it , because in certain areas we shall have to take action without expecting reciprocity. I entirely agree with him. But in certain matters we shall have to go a little slow.

Coming to the most important question with regard to our neighbours, I feel we have been able to tackle one important issue and I must congratulate the Nepalese Parliament for the retification of the Mahakali Pancheshwar Treaty because that was a landmark treaty to improve relations between India and Nepal. Not only that, if we

can harness the Himalayan water, we will be able to sort out another major problem with which we are confronted today in relation to Bangladesh. Ultimately, the basic question about giving water to Bangladesh from the Farakka remains. We cannot avoid the question of augmentation. Even if we go back to the formula of 1977 where it was suggested that they would get 34,500 cusecs in the lean season with a minimum guarantee of 28,000 cusecs. That much water will have to be made available. If sometimes we find that 50,000 cusecs or 55,000 cusecs of water is available at the distribution point, then from where will we give it? Even if we agree to have 50: 50 share—25,000 cusecs to each country—if the water available is 50,000 cusecs, then that is not adequate. Therefore, augmentation is needed. In order to have augmentation, we can think of only two projects and one of the projects is the Mahakoshi Project which has some relevance with this—for this project, agreement has been signed—and if it could be taken to its logical conclusion of harnessing the Himalayan waters, then we can augment the Ganga waters at the upper region of Farakka. Farakka is the distribution point from where we can give more water to Bangladesh.

Then, one of our colleagues raised the question of visit of the Chief Minister of West Bangal to Bangladesh. We should not look at this from narrow angle. So far as I understand, it is not that the Foreign Ministry has abdicated its responsibility, but at the same time, it is equally a fact that the direct party concerned is West Bangal. I remember, in 1982, when the Five-Year Agreement of 1977 was over, I had the privilege of participating in the negotiations. At that point of time, the West Bengal Government, on record, said that they will require 40,000 cusecs of water to protect the Calcutta port. At that time, the Chief Minister wrote to me. Even in 1995, he wrote to me that they would require 40,000 cusecs of water. Therefore, if today he goes and talks to the leaders of Bangladesh and he is convinced that Bangladesh is to be given additional water and he will have to manage it—after all, the Chief Minister will have to face the music—then, what is wrong in it? It is not that he is going there to sign an agreement. It is not at all correct. The agreement is to be signed between two sovereign countries and not with any provincial government. If I have understood it correctly, here I must tell you very frankly, that he invited all the political parties at a conference to ascertain their views before he went to Dhaka. In that meeting, he made it quite clear that neither he was going to have any negotiations....

SHRI VISHNU KANT SHASTRI (Uttar Pradesh): All the parties were not called to that meeting...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Shastriji, I am sorry, the problem is...(*Interruptions*)... When we call the political parties, we adopt the same practice both in Parliament and in States. Those parties which are represented either in Parliament or in State Assembly are called for such meetings. You are a very big party, no doubt. Today you are the single largest party of 161 Members in Lok Sabha, but unfortunately, after 1952, since 1957, neither your incarnation as Jan Sangh nor as BJP could have a single MLA. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHNU KANT SHASTRI: We had in 1967. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I don't remember that you had an MLA in 1977. ...(*Interruptions*)... I am always correct in my figures and dates. You contested the elections sometime in June and before that Jan Sangh merged with Janata Party. ...(*Interruptions*)... Jan Sangh merged with Janata Party and Janata Party came into existence. I think so many leaders of Janata Party are here. ...(*Interruptions*)... The point is you don't have any representation. In 1952, Jan Sangh had representation. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: इससे क्या होने जा रहा है। ...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI VISHNU KANT SHASTRI: All the parties should be consulted. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am sorry, I am not yielding. I am correct on my part. This is the parliamentary practice.

THE LEADER OF OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): We are talking of our own interests and not of Bangladesh. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am talking about an all-party meeting taken by the Chief Minister. ...(*Interruptions*)... Again you are mistaken, Mr. Sikander Bakht.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Not at all. I am not mistaken. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Shastriji referred to the all party meeting. You can go through the record. When I said that the Chief Minister had called a meeting of all parties before he went to Dhaka, his objection was that BJP was not called. I mentioned that BJP was not called by the Chief Minister because it did not have any representation in the West Bengal Assembly. You are a big party here but you do not have any existence in West Bengal. Therefore, it is not correct to say that while utilising the services of the Chief Minister the Foreign Minister has done something wrong. Rather, I would say, it is a clever move. If he can achieve success and if he can resolve the issue with the help of the Chief Minister, I would like to congratulate him and I would also say 'good luck' to him. What is to be done? This is simply beside point. We cannot forget the fact that today, when the geo-political situation is going through a rapid change, democratic process has started after a long time in Bangladesh. We are the single largest democratic force in this region. Can be keep our eyes shut and not help the democratic process to start and strengthen in our own region? What is happening in Pakistan? Since 1947 no constitution has survived for ten years. No political executive, whether civil or military, has completed a full five year term except Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto. The democratic process has been throttled there. It is their internal matter to adopt their own constitution. But the fact is these are the hard core facts. If we know that the democratic process in the neighbouring countries has been strengthened, being the single largest democracy, it would be easier for us to handle. Therefore, a situation has been created. We should not forget it. I come from that region and I know it. There are still 10 million Hindus there. If fundamentalist forces gain ground in that area, it is not a very comfortable position for us. Therefore, if forces which are trying to check fundamentalist forces get a little better treatment, I do not find anything wrong in it. Nobody is going to compromise the national interest and it has to be recognised. I know that 40,000 cusecs of water is needed for maintaining the Calcutta port from the Farakka point. But there have been instances where not even 27,000 to 30,000 cusecs of waters were available. What are you going to do? Can you have a situation where the upper region will not draw waters? Can you stop a project starting from Haridwar to Rajmohal? Simply you cannot do it. When the river flows people draw water for irrigation, for drinking water etc. You cannot say, "No, such and such quantum of water will be required to flush Calcutta port and, therefore, we will not draw water." Such a situation cannot be created. (*Interruptions*) Therefore, what is needed? Mr. Vice-Chairman, water has to be augmented. Here, I would request the Foreign Minister to take note of it. When the Water Resources Minister and the Foreign Minister of Bangladesh came and held discussions with me, I tried to prevail upon them. I said, "We are prepared to accommodate as much as we can, but, at the same time, you will have

to go in for augmentation. Augmentation is possible through Mahakosi of Nepal and of Bhutan rivers. I do not know what would be the fate of Jaldapara forest." If we have another project of Bhutan rivers, Mansa-Sankoshi, which has been talked about, what happens? The moot point is, water must be made available. Water flow must be augmented so that we can meet the requirement of Bangladesh to a considerable extent because it is necessary.

I am sorry. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will take four more minutes. I will complete then.

Why am I suggesting this? Because a permanent solution is needed, not because of political expediency.

The benefit which we will get in terms of economy, in terms of trade, in terms of transit, in terms of having integration with the North-Eastern Region, in term of money and in terms of value, would be enough. Therçfore, this aspect we cannot completely ignorc. The economy of that region will be completely changed. They have gas. They cannot consume that much of gas; they cannot consume that much of electricity. We can build up despite this fact—please do not forget this—that our export-import ratio almost is 90:10. Our export to Bangaladesh out of 100 is 90 and their export to our country is only ten. If we give 30 or 40 items duty-free, it cannot increase more than ten to fifteen. P.C. If you allow them this, their economy will grow. If their economy grows one of the constant problems of illegal migrants—it is not political, it is not communal; it is basically economic; they come here because they do not find jobs,they do not find food; but if you can help to build up their economy problem of migration—can also be resolved. Therefore, larger interests are also involved in it. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, on this they may not agree with me. But I cannot help. Truth is truth.

Now, there is one more issue to which I would like to draw your attention and it is in regard to Afghanistan. It is true that we are participating in the Iranian initiative. We have also joined the meeting of experts drawn from certain countries by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. But, I am a little unhappy because the way and particularly the time which we took to respond to the dastardly killing of Najibulla. The unfortunate part is that he was in the UN Headquarters. The effectiveness of the UN Mission was so that they could not protect him. Sir, not only we supported in the '80s the Government which he headed but even his family is located here. Therefore, our response, delayed response, does not speak of our traditional position there. Simply we cannot ignore the fact that Taliban is nothing but an outfit a creation of Pakistan. Therefore, if they make an advance there, if they make dent there, it is bound to have repercussion on our security and in that our geo-political security is going to be affected. The Harkat-ul-Ansar to whom they have handed over the training centres and training facilities to train militants for Kashmir is going to cause havoc here. Therefore, to contain Talibans is our objective.

I am glad that, though it is a little belated, we are participating in the initiative taken by Iran and the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We should continue to have this effort because in Afghanistan our interest is not only nostalgic or historical but it is very vital in our economic and political interest also. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is very often said that the world has changed. Whether it is unipolar or multipolar, I do not know. If you see from military point of view, perhaps you are quite right, it is unipolar. But from economic point of view it is multipolar. Today Japan or Germany or even the neo-tigers, the ASEAN tigers which are emerging after ten or fifteen years are going to be euqally econimcally powerful. Therefore, today it is not one aspect of

the international relations that is to be emphasised. Perhaps in the second half of this century which in one way is distinct from the first half despite cold war and localised consideration, the world had an advantage of prolonged peace. In the first half of the century, we had two wars—the First World War and the Second World War. But, in the second half of the century, we did not have any. Another advantage is that cold war has come to an end. Let us take full advantage of the situation of peace and security which has been created.

Tremendous technological advances are taking place and we shall have to play an important role. Our strength will depend not on how much strong words we use in international fora but to a considerable extent on what our GNP is, what our volume of external trade is and what our technological development is. In that context certain major events are going to take place and I request the hon. Minister for External Affairs to take been interest, particularly, in the Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organisation where three important issues on which India has vital interests, like investment, like procurement, like social clause are going to be debated we must have a view. And here, on these three issues—on CTBT and NPT we could not muster the support of non-Aligned friends—we can muster their support. Theefore, the close international trade and international policies must be interlinked and we should not merely be obsessed with balance of power but at the same time, we should equally take into account that the balance of payment has no less relevance to that of balance of power. Thank you.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, generally, it did not happen but this time I find that I fully endorse what Pranab Babu has just said. Almost, word by word, I agree with what he has said on a number of issues, including Bangladesh and China. I thought, I would say the same thing as Professor Malhotra has said because our foreign policy is rooted in a national consensus, is rooted in our history, in our geopolitics, in our tradition and in our culture. In fact, when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee became the Foreign Minister, in 1977, some of us had the fear, at that time, that he may change the foreign policy. He did not. In fact, he was the one who went to China and conducted a dialogue with China. Apart from all the other aspects, this is an issue on which there will be no room for disagreement between us, between the Congress party and between the BJP. For this reason I am somewhat worried about the statement made by Professor Malhotra. He said, 'things are changing. Should we continue with the same policy?' What is he suggesting? Is he suggesting that we should change from Non-Alignment to Alignment? Let him say so very clearly. Does he intended that we should join with America? Tell us so. Why should we feel shy about it? If they feel today that the time has come to abandon our Non-Aligned foreign policy, then let them be frank, let them be candid, let them come out openly with whatever they have in mind. Let us have a proper discussion. I would not like Malhotraji to make such statements indirectly by way of an *innuendo* and all that. He should really come out with what actually he has in mind. At the same time, I find that some of the points he is making are not tallying with his statement that the world is changing. The world is changing also with respect to China. In 1962, there was a war with China. We have some territorial problems with China. Are we only having territorial problems with our neighbours? Look at Europe. Italy has a territorial problem with Austria on South Tyron. England has a territorial problem with Spain on Zibralter. Germany has a problem with France. Germany has a problem with Poland. There are so many other disagreements. In spite of all these, they came together on the economic front. They formed a common market

where anybody can go from one part of Europe to another without any passport, can take up any job, buy any property, acquire land, etc. Why cannot you do the same thing? In 1962 there was an unfortunate war. Since then a lot of water has passed through the rivers. Why cannot we bring about an understanding with China, leaving the territorial issue on one side, to have fruitful relations with China? This is necessary for two other reasons: (1) economic reason. Look at what the Americans are saying. If you go through the American plan, you would find that they have identified China and India as the two major areas of potential growth in the Twenty-first Century. There is so much of emphasis in the American foreign policy, in the American economic policy, on China. Why? Because the Chinese market is a large one, so much so that there is a lot of trade between China and the United States. At one time, in relation to GATT, the U.S. Government did not want to give the 'most favoured nation' treatment to China. But subsequently, they had to reverse this policy because of protests from American businessmen.

I would like to raise the question here. Why should we not take advantage of the market that our great neighbour has? The Chinese market is a huge market which could benefit us.

Another reason why we should have a good and proper relationship with China is that we have to take a position in international affairs. In GATT, for example, there are various difficulties. The United States and other Western countries are trying to impose their kind of agreement on us. How do we fight this? Unless we form alliances, alliances with countries like China, we cannot fight this war along.

For all these reasons, I would request our colleagues from the BJP to take these things into account and to support the efforts being made by the Government, the efforts initiated by Pranab babu when he was the Foreign Minister. I congratulated him at that time. This should be continued and we should have substantial and proper economic and cultural relationship with our great neighbour, China.

On Bangladesh, I have very little to add to what Pranab babu has already said. All that I would say is this. When Jyoti babu went to Bangladesh and held discussions, he did not deviate from whatever brief had been given to him by Gujralji. Jyoti babu talked to Gujralji before he went to Bangladesh. Whatever he said there was strictly in terms of the brief given to him by Gujralji.

No agreement was signed. An agreement would be signed by the Indian Government which would be mutually beneficial. At the same time, we have to take into account the fact that a secular Government has come to power now in Bangladesh. It is not a fundamentalist Government. There has been a change. There is a democratic Government now in Bangladesh. Should we not encourage this? A young lady has become the Prime Minister of that country. She is facing a lot of difficulties. Even today, there is a fundamentalist lobby in that country which is trying to unseat her. Should we not help her in her difficulties? In that process, we would be helping ourselves. If we can actually come to an agreement with Bangladesh on water, we should welcome it.

Here, Sir, I would like to make a request to all the parties in Parliament. We should not make water an issue, as far as our relationship with Bangladesh is concerned. I would also request Pranab babu to ask his partymen in West Bengal not to make this an issue. Whatever settlement may be signed with Bangladesh should be seen as a settlement, in line with the interests of the country and for forging good neighbourly relations with that country. I would suggest that water should not be made a big issue and it should not be used for petty political purposes.

I would also like to point out that we

need augmentation of water. I agree with Pranab babu. Earlier, most of the water from the Ganges flowed up to West Bengal and then to the Bay of Bengal. Because of the progress which has been made in Indian agriculture—of course, it is a good thing—most of the water was being utilised either in Uttar Pradesh or in Haryana or in Punjab or in Rajasthan. The quantum of water which reaches Rajmahal is very limited. If we can augment the water by getting more water from Bhutan and Nepal, that would be an advantage.

In the past, there have been problems; there has been a serious problem; there has been a difficulty. What was that? At least, commonsense dictated that India, Bangladesh and Nepal should sit together for arriving at a proper arrangement on distribution of water in the whole area so that we could irrigate the land in this large area. This would also facilitate transport. We can produce electricity and this could also be an important source of entertainment. There are very good places where you have so much of water, not so much water as in the Amazon, but almost as much water as in any other area in the world. Even though there is so much of water, because of certain problems, the water resources could not be properly harnessed.

What happened in the past? The Indian Government did not want to take part in a tripartite meeting. India would hold talks with Bangladesh, but not with Nepal as the third party because of the fear that Bangladesh and Nepal would gang up together. That was poor diplomacy.

Much better diplomacy would have been to bring them together. If Napal is economically tied to us, Nepal would also become, politically, in terms of foreign relations, tied to us. There was nothing to fear. Even if they gang up on certain issue, so what? So this poor foreign policy, poor diplomacy, led to the price which we had to pay in that there was no proper agreement on the augmentation of water.

Nepal is a resource-poor country, but it can export power. Bhutan is resource-poor, but it can also export power. Why should we not take advantage of it? Give them the opportunity. When you have problems, sit over with them and let them produce power and give it to us for the national grid. So that is the kind of approach which was neccessary and which was lacking in the past, and I hope it would be taken up now.

Now, having said all this, I would also congratulate our Foreign Minister for taking a lot of initiative in the foreign policy. What should be the basis of our foreign policy? We are a very poor military power. We cannot threaten anybody, we cannot overwhelm anybody by force. Nobody would be bothered about us. Excepting our small neighbours, nobody would bother about us. We are a poor economic power, one of the poorest 20 countries in the world. Why should anybody vote for us in the Security Council? Why should anybody support us in the international areana? We can muster support not through our military might, not through our economic power, but only by way of our moral leadership. We should not speak only for ourselves: we should speak for the third world countries as a whole, for the non-aligned countries as a whole. That was the tradition which was there from the 50's. In that golden age of the foreign policy of India in the 50's what were we? We were also a very poor and militarily weak country. But because we took a principled stand—and we said, "No, we will not join any military pact"—we had to suffer a lot due to the Americans, because in every meeting of the United Nations they would raise the issue of Kashmir, and Russia had to veto it, not to allow it to be taken up there. But

even then we continued to do that and we paid the price, but the fruits were borne later. When the African countries became independent, they joined the Non-Aligned Movement. Unfortunately, the Non-Aligned Movement is now in a very weak State. Unfortunately, again, we have only one Super Power today, not two Super Powers. We cannot bargain. In this weak situation, there are certain difficulties. But to the extent we have taken a very strong and bold stand on CTBT and the Non-Proliferation Treaty, we have earned some respect. We have lost the Security Council election, which is unfortunate. May be there was some wrong assessment of votes and all that, but heavens are not going to fall. We must try to build up our own relationship with the non-aligned countries, which is extremely important, and that should be of moral leadership. Whether it is in Rwanda or other places, our moral leadership should be there.

Coming to Afghanistan now, having established myself, by tradition, as a strong supporter of the Foreign Minister, let me now express some reservations with regard to some of his policies on Afghanistan. I have two major criticisms to make. Afghanistan is our corridor to the Central Asian countires; it is our corridor to the old Silk Route. If something goes wrong in Afghanistan, we are bound to be influenced by it. There have been many cultural exchanges in the past. And I say this: If the Afghanistan regime becomes a fundamentalist, communal, regime, that will also have its implications on India because there will be countervailing communal forces within the country which would also emerge. So Afghanistan is very important for us.

Unfortunately, when the Taliban takeover happened on the 27th of September and Najibullah and his brother were shot and then hanged in a very brutal, savage, way, we did nothing. Until the 12th of October—which means, for a fotnight—our Foreign Ministry was completely silent on such a ghastly murder of the Head of the State within the precincts of the United Nations and nothing came forth from our Government. On the 4th October our Foregin Minister made a statement in the UN General Assembly regarding Afghanistan—I have gone through his statement. It is a very general kind of statement condemning violence, Condemning encroachment of territorial inetgrity and asking for a peaceful dialogue. There is nothing in his statement condemning the ghastly murder of the Najibullah brothers.

It took fifteen days for such a statement to come up. All that was coming out from the Foreign Ministry during those days was that we were watching the situation. I think that it was very very unfortunate. Whether the Foregin Minister is located here or somewhere else, he remains the Foregin Minister. There should have been regular, daily contacts between him and his office. There should have been a clear, catgorical statment from here on the 28th September itself, not on the 12th of October, condemning the murder of the Najibulla brothers, and that was not done until the 12th of October. I think it was very very unfortunate.

Another thing which, I think, is unfortunate is this. I know that our Foreign Minister is very much involved and interested in history. I have heard some of his statements at various places, that do not reflect that sense of history as far as Afghanistan is concerned. I have heard him saying on several occasions, "We are opposed to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan." The word "occupation", I think is objectionable. In any case, that is his interpretation, that the Soviet Union's entry into Afghanistan was unfortunate and that he would not support it.

I have a certain claim to make a statement on this because on the 27th of April, 1978 when the Saur revolution took place in Afghanistan, when the Khalq regime came to power by ousting

the Dawood regime, I was in Kabul on that particualr day. It is not because of me that it happened, let me assure you. For a few months I was in Afghanistan as a Member of the International Labour Organisation's Employment Mission, and it gave me an opportunity to go to most of the provinces of Afghanistan. Excepting for Badakshan in the North and the Raigisthan in the South, I had been to almost all the provinces. So, whenever I read newspapers these days and see the names of Kandahar, Herat, Kundus, Ghazni, Balk, Salang Pass, Mazaare-Sharief and so on, it brings back the memories of those days.

I want to make it categorically clear here that when this coup took place, there was not a single Russian involved in it. There were two other Indians in the ILO Mission. One of them was a former Member of Rajya Sabha, Mrs. Ila Bhatt. She was with me. You can check it up with her because Mrs. Ila and myself walked on foot throughout Kabul those days through fires and all that, risking our lives. I can testify that there was not a single Russian there. The only Russian who was there was a Member of our ILO team, one Mr. Kuzmin. He was scared to go out because there were Russain tanks. He did not want to be photographed by the side of a Russian tank. He was the only Russian who was visible there. There was no other Russian there. There was no Russian involvement in that particular change of Government in April, 1978.

But why did the change come about? The regime which was set up by Noor Mohammed Tariki, a very well known poet in Afghanistan, was a secular regime. It was not a communist regime. "Khalq Party" means democratic party. It had a kind of communist programme. That is true. But the programme they were implementing in Afghanistan was a democratic, secular programme and not a communist programme. This democratic, secular programme created a fear in the minds of Pakistan.... (*Time bell rings*)

I want another four or five minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I would like to hear you for more time, but you have taken twice the time allotted to you.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I am making a very important point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I know that. I am very much interested in your speech. I may like to hear it. But you have taken double the time.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: It scared Pakistan, Iran and the United States. I am very glad to say that Iran is inviting us now. It is on our side today. There is a rift between iran and Pakistan. I am very happy about it. But, in those days, Iran and Pakistan, the two enemies were united to oust the secular regime because Iran was a fundamentalist country and Pakistan was a fundamentalist country. Both of them had an interest in ousting that regime in Afghanistan, and they were supported by the United States.

You must have seen the statement made by Mrs. Bhutto before she was thrown out. In that statment, she made an interesting point. I do not know whether it has come to the notice of our Foregin Affairs Minister. She said that one of the reasons for the Americans to give all these aircraft—they promised to give aircraft and all the arms—to Pakistan was that Pakistan agreed to play the role of a conduit for the supply of arms to the rebels in Afghanistan in those days. And an amount of four billion dollars was sent through the Pakistani ISI to reach the rebels in Afghanistan in those days! And it was in that situation that the Government of Tariki and later the Government of Amin, because of the combined military might of Iran, Pakistan and the United States, had no other choice but to ask for the support of the Soviet Union. The Soviet support came nearly 20 months of the Saur revolution in 1978. The Soviets came because there was

already an aggression. we never talk about this. The notes prepared by our Government never mentioned this. There was an aggression on Afghan territory by Pakistan, by Iran and by the United States. And that forced the Afghan Government to seek the support of the Soviet Union and the Soviet support came. Now, they might have made some mistakes in the way they functioned and all that. I am not going into them here. From the point of view of India, our best bet was a secular regime in Afghanistan, for instance, the Najibulla regime. What support did we give to Najibulla? I think Pranab Babu should have answered this question. Maybe it is not time now. But the question is this. When this conspiracy was going on against Najibulla, when all these arms were flowing in through Pakistan to all these rebels, when Pakistan sponsored Gulbuddin Hekmatiyar and others, how much support did you actually give to Najibulla to ensure that he could survive belligerency? You should not forget that for three years, Najibulla fought alone without the Soviet support against the might of Pakistan, Iran and the United States together. There was a need for the Indian Government to give support partly because that was proper and partly because it was in our interest. My fear is that that was not done. And now, you are landing in a situation where you have the Talibans.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: That was done.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Maybe. (*Interruptions*). Maybe. He should explain that.

Now, we have this situation of Talibans being in control. I think many of the regimes in the world are not Islamic. I cannot mention all the regimes. But there is the Mobutu regime. it is a fascist, authoritarian and reactionary regime. The Taliban regime is also one of the most authoritarian and reactionary regimes we can think of. Think of their attitude towards women; think of their attitude towards civil liberties in general; think of the ghastly murder of the Najibulla brothers. They are not Islamic. I do not think they are Islamic. In most of the Muslim countries, they have changed their laws. I had been to Tunisia; I had been to Algeria, Syria, Egypt, Iraq and Turkey. They have different kinds of Islamic laws which have nothing to do with amputation of legs and hands. From all these barbarous things, they have dissociated themselves. And there is no reason to think that Talibans are great champions of Islam. That may not be the case. But, in any case, it is a reactionary regime; there is a danger to us; there is a danger to the world; there is a danger to humanity; and certainly, we should do everything possible to ensure that they do not form the Government of Afghanistan. Even now, they are not in government of Afghanistan. They are just in occupation of Kabul. They should not be allowed to form the Government of Afghanistan.

Lastly, this rise in Islamic fundamentalism which you see the worldover is, unfortunately, supported by the rise of some other types of fundamentalism in our country. But this rise has been largely due to the policy of the United States in the West Asian countries since the 50's. In the 50's, which were the countries in west Asian that were secular? They were the countries like Syria, Egypt, Iraq and Algeria. They were secular. But they were also the countries which were not willing to join the Americans.

So, the Americans pampered and promoted the Saudi Arabia, the Gulf countries and the most rabid communal elements in order to disrupt the non-aligned movement in that area. They were also interested in Afghanistan because that was the way to make inroads into the Central Asian Republics, which were within the Soviet Union, but which were largely having the Muslim population. Unfortunately, the United States of America have succeeded in their plans. But it is for us to realise what the

United States of America can do and what they have been doing in Czechoslovakia. They have divided the population on communal lines. Now, the Muslims and the Christians are fighting between themselves. We should never allow this to happen to India. We should never allow the Americans, the Western forces to divide our nation on communal lines. For this, it is necessary that our foreign policy becomes active, our foreign policy becomes vigorous, and we champion not only the interests of our country but also the causes of secularism and non-alignement the world over. That is the only way in which we can establish our leadership in the world.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there have been very distinguished speakers before me—the former Foreign Minister and the experts...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): You are also a distinguished person.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: But I have never been in the Foreign Ministry. Anyway, I must say that our foreign policy has always reflected a national consensus. Right from the freedom movement, our foreign policy was very much a part of our national aspirations and we were able to look across party lines, across other internal differences, when it came to the expression of our international perceptions. The freedom movement itself saw its fight, imperialism, fascism, colonialism at various stages and apartheid. We were the first to go to the United Nations on many of these issues even before we became free and I think that what emerged after freedom by way of non-alignment, was very much a part our national movement, a national consensus. We became the spokesperson of the developing countries, those fighting for freedom on those seeking justice for themselves, whether it was South Africa or Namibia or Indo-China or Palestine or Vietnam or Suez or UNCTAD or the Uruguay round or the United Nations; we had a stand. We were bold enough to express ourselves. Our opinion was sought and our leadership was respected, and most of all, we were asked to help sort our problems where others could not. From this background, when we look at ourselves and our performance and our own standing, whether it is international fora or even in our own region. One can only say: What a fall my countrymen! I must say that with the cold war gone, non-alignment, many people believe—both perhaps, on my right and on my left—has become rather outdated and of no consequence. There are many in this country who are talking about reviewing our foreign policy option and telling us that non-alignment perhaps will not hold us in good stead anymore, that we are being isolated and we are being cornered in a socalled single polar world. Sir, I must say that the recent election bid which we made for a non-permanent seat of the Security Council showed that we have lost our standing somewhere. Not that everybody expected us to walk in in the first round. but we are told, and I believe it, and I have been reading about it, that the mandarins in South Block had assured that there was no question of a victory in the first round for the Japanese; that we would automatically go into the second round and that would be the stage at which we should negotiate. Sir, we know what happened. It was not a defeat. It was a humiliating defeat I would like to say that and replies have come very often that we started it...We devided to bid in 1994; you pressurised us, and so on and so forth. Sir, I would like to say that a Government at a particular time may have a particular perception. We did believe, at that time given the circumstances, that we stood a good chance, but I would like to ask what your assessment was, what your feedback was. We had been told that 138 countries were visited by high-powered, specially selected delegations of this Government, and when I, in another

forum, questioned who led these delegations, who were the people who went, what their feedback was, the people, not the Foreign Affairs Minister, in the Foreign Affairs Ministry had to admit that they were all led by bureaucrats—former bureaucrats, retired bureaucrats, extension bureaucrats; call them what you want. You don't have the foresight to realise that if you are talking about winning over opinion in any country, you need political leadership, not bureaucratic meddling. Is this country so devoid of political leadership today? You have a consensus on Foreign Policy, you have all parties supporting you on these issues; why do you believe that only bureaucrats can deliver the goods? And, Sir, this is my first complaint. In South block once you—I am not only talking of this Government, but I am also talking about the national interests and the long-term policy perspectives--have lost the political leadership, as far as the Foreign Affairs Ministry is concerned,—and let the bureaucrats take decisions, without meaning to offend anybody—I think, you begin to lose your international perspectives, and I believe, Sir, that even on the issue of election, this election, there was a difference of opinion between those sitting here and those sitting at the U.N. I know that there were differences of opinion; I have got it from very reliable sources, the opinions did not tally; a decision had to be taken. And you decided that prestige was more important; you are in the fight, you can't give up! Sir, there are times when one must realise that one has to step down; you sometimes have to bow when you realise the circumstances, but you were not prepared to do it, and this is what happened. What was your perception? What was your feedback? What was your compulsion? Knowing that ultimately you were having much higher stakes for a permanent seat in the Council why do you want to expose yourself at this stage and show what your standing in the international arena was? I think, it was a misguided adventure, and I am sorry to say that it has left, a sense of disappointment in the country as a whole.

Sir, I would certainly like also to talk about, rather ask, what is happening about our other long-term perspectives of a permanent seat in the Security Council. After this disaster, Have withdrawn, have we given up, are we just too disheartened to even talk about it? ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: What is your advice?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, I have no advice to offer. You are in South Block; you should be telling us what you are planning to do.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I would like to be guided by your advice. Please tell me something. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, if you seek our advice, we will certainly give it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Madam, I have, at every stage, sought your advice. Ask Pranabji.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, you have been asking him, not me!

Sir, I understand that there was a Special Group set up within the U.N. system to study the various options for the expansion of the Security Council and to come back with its recommendations to the General Assembly. This Group had not come to any definite decision till some time back and as was expected, and we wanted that these negotiations and discussions should go on, but I am afraid, Sir from what we hear, that this Group is now suddenly wanting to wind up and make a recommendation suggesting that Germany and Japan should get permanent seats and three more seats should go, by voting, within specific regions. Sir, you know that they come out to a consensus just to get out of having to face any kind of open contest and this Report is sought to be brought prematurely again through a two-third vote in the Assembly so that it comes up and it is over. I am only requesting, are

we, at least, taking enough precautions to see that this is not rushed through? Can we lobby and see that this does not become a *fait accompli* even before we recover from the disaster which we have just faced? Are we able to do something? Or, will we sit back and say that it was inevitable, it is a unipolar world, the Americans took a decision and we have no choice? I think a time has come where there should be some kind of a discussion on all these issues. I am not talking one party contradicting another or if one person pulling another down. I am talking about what can realy become something for which we can all work together. We are also talking today of a very important issue of the election of the next Secretary-General. What is our opinion? Do we go along with those who veto Mr. Boutros Boutros Ghali? Do we have a stand? Have we formed any kind of opinion? Are we lobbying—Are we part of any group? Or, will we sit back and say that we are non-aligned, we have no opinion, whoever is elected is good enough for us?

जहाँ मजॉरिटी जाएगी वहाँ हम वोट डाल देंगे।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): What is your advice?

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Sir, if I were to decide, I should be sitting there and not you.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: You are welcome.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I am saying that I cannot just say do this and do that. This is only a discussion.

DR. PIPLAB DASGUPTA: Why can't you say that you should support Mr. Ghali? Why can't you.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Let me come to my own points of view. I have not seen till today that our Govenment is making any kind of a move saying that we are supporting him. I know that we supported him in the first election. I can say today that I carried a letter from him to our former Prime Minister. I was in Egypt at that time. We said, "We would give unconditional support." I want to know what your stand today is.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I authorise you to do the same again.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Anyway, Sir, this is a thing on which, I feel, the Government should take a stand in time and let us know where we stand. After all, we are part of the developing world. We need to make others feel that we stand by them at this time. Some kind of a leadership role to find out a consensus, to work out something, is very much called for from a senior and very experienced person like Mr. Gujral.

Sir, as far as the ASEAN initiative is concerned, we had high hopes that the doors were opening, we would be a part of this APEC and the sort of economic identity which was emerging. But we find now that it has been put of. We are going to be out for quite some time because of the moratorium which has been decided on. I don't know whether it has been deliberately done or for what reason. We have again been kept out there. This is where I come to what has been said by others also that ultimately it is our capacity to stand up and show that we have the economic strength to withstand all the pressures that matter. I know what the answers are going to be. They will say, "You started it. It was all that you were doing." I can see Mr. Chidambaram smiling at me. I am talking about whether we are going with our so-called economic reforms and our opening up process. I do want to say that this country has stood all these years on its own capacity. We are talking of 50 years of freedom. We have stood with certain grit and determination and we have been able to withstand pressures. We were going to be an economy which is able to sustain itself when pressures come.

Sir, when the cryogenic engine, the technology transfer, was denied to us,

there was a furore in the House. I still remember what the then Prime Minister, P. V. Narasimha Raoji, said. He said, "They cannot beat the Indian grain. They may try to browbeat us." Ultimately, we showed that we could produce it. May be, there was a little delay. We are capable. We have the brain. We have the power to do it ourselves. Today we are opening up. We are talking of investments. But I want to say that it is not infrastructure that is being built. It is the consumer sector which is being built up, which is eating the money that is coming from everywhere. I want to point out that it is your companies which are being bought. All the money that is coming in is going into buying controlling shares. I want to know how much of infrastructure is being created and how much of real developmental investment is coming in. Companies are going to the BIFR. Public sector is gradually disappearing. Whatever capacity we had within us to withstand these pressures is gradually going. I want to say today, even at the cost, maybe of being told that this was my party's stand, that the time has come to review policy and relook at decisions before they are just rushed through. Let us not believe that in the name of liberalisation and globalisation, everything that we have built over these 50 years has to be undone. I believe that pride in what we have built is more important for us. The only language that the world understands is the language of self-confidence and power within the country. What is happening to our defence preparedness? It is unfortunate. I am not saying this. But we see the news papers everyday: The Defence Minister gives the impression of being on conscription duty in the Defence Minstry. He has no time. Half the time, he is making it clear that he is more interested in UP politics and in going as Chief Minister of UP rather than running the Defence Ministry. It is repeatedly being said that not enough investment or resources are being made available to the defence forces. I hope I am wrong. I hope that the reports are wrong. But it is for the Government to clarify and give an impression to the world that we are prepared and that we are not a lame-duck Government which does not have the capacity to prepare for our defence. These are the impressions which are going out of a country which really does not know where it is going. How can we be respected? How can we have a say anywhere if this is the image that we are giving of our country? More pressures are going to be built up on the economic front in the next round of negotiations at the WTO. Social clauses, patent laws, everything else is going to be pushed down our throat. I think it is time for us to forget our own internal differences and stand up as one and see that the interest of the contry is protected first. It is only then that we will be respected. It is only then that other countries will be able to look upon us as a country which has the courage to take a stand and express its views. I know that many say it was our stand on the CTBT that led to our isolation or cornerning. It is a temporary phase. But I think we are respected for having had the courage to take a stand. I hope we will not buckle under pressure. I will not repeat many of the points which have already been made. But I do come to SAARC. This region really represents for us a great opportunity to build an economic community and, maybe, in the long run a political entity, if I may say so—I am not talking in terms of creating a misunderstanding. But we need to create a kind of political entity here—of working together. Fifty years after freedom, what do we do? We decide to invite the Queen of England to preside over our celebrations. I have nothing against her. ...(*Interruptions*)... It is in the news papers. This is what I read. There is a letter which has been circulated to us. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have all the respect for you. But I suggest, in the national interest, 'don't debase us by saying that we are inviting the Queen to preside over any function.'

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Not to preside over the celebrations, but she has been invited as a special guest for the occasion.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL : No.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I am glad you clarified that. But I will send you the letters that we have received. It has been circulated to all the Members of Parliament. It says that this is most a uncalled for gesture on the part of the Government. I will send it to you since you have denied it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: The main point is that we were approached by the British Government saying that the Queen would like to visit India. The dates have not been finalised. John Major is also coming in the beginning of January. So are many more people coming because in Calcutta there is going to be a big jamboree. Our major functions are the 26th of January and the 15th of August and these will be celebrated in context with the dignity of India.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I would say, when we celebrate 50 years of freedom, I think an initiative could be taken. The region has had a common struggle against colonialism and imperialism. Maybe, some kind of a joint effort at bringing together these freedom fighters to the sub-continent to mark this common battle against imperialism...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: That is being done. I will not let you down.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: This is something which I believe would create a common platform within the region and give us something to stand together and mark a very historic fact of the freedom movement. Sir, I would, with this, also mention a couple of things. I have no quarrel with Jyoti Basu or with Pranab Da and I do realise the Bengali sentiments as far as my friend Biplab is concerned. But I may only talk about the perception of the late Chief Ministers negotiating international agreements. Sir, I have nothing against talking to Bangladesh or talking to anybody. Then, would you say if there is a problem in Jammu and Kashmir, let Farooq Abdullah go and negotiate with Pakistan? If there is a problem with Sri Lanka over LTTE or something else, would you say, send Karunanidhi or Moopanar and tell them to negotiate what must be sorted out as far as the Tamil issue is concerned! Would you say, you send Bhandari or somebody else to go and negotiate with Nepal? I believe...

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: One minute. I think it is rather pertinent to say. He has gone there, he was not negotiating anything. Negotiations and finalisation will be done here. Since you are talking for the other regions and since you are a student of history, I would recommend, you to kindly go into history and see what was not done. It is on record that Mr. Rajiv Gandhi utilised the services of the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu for talking to them. It is on record. It is on record that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru deputed Sheikh Abdullah after coming out of jail to travel Pakistan to soften the situation. It is on record that the Government of Congress here deputed other people to go to Nepal. If you want to tell history, it is different; but I take pride in the fact that Inidan polity is so constituted that we do not think of softening or advancing the cause of our country, saying Government only should be responsible. Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee had been sent as leader of a delegation on the Human Rights Commission. I was also deputed as leader of a delegation; I take pride in it.

[**The Deputy Chairman** in the Chair]

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I agree with you. You can go as leader of a delegation, as a national delegation. I think that if they are gong, there must be some kind of a delegation which represents a national consensus when you go. Anyway this is my point of view. You may have another perception, I have no problem. But I believe that whomsoever

you are negotiating with, it should be as a national delegation and I think, not that Mr. Jyoti Basu is not a nationalist, but he is not a national figure, but I believe that if you start allowing States to negotiate according to their local problems across the borders, you will run into problems in the long-run. I do not agree though, it may have been done at one point of time.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: No, no, neither then nor now are they negotiating. Mr. Jyoti Basu did not negotiate. I can assure that Mr. Jyoti Basu went there on the invitation of the Prime Minister of Bangladesh and I think it was a good gesture that we are having our important leaders travel to other countries. It was a good gesture that we also utilised—whether sitting on this side or the other side—the services of our eminent personalities to help in this. But may I tell you one thing? The only national delegation which went from India to Bangladesh was led by me. I have negotiated, I shall continue to negotiate and negotiations and finalisation of agreements with Bangladesh or with any other country will be done in Delhi.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: About Afghanistan enough has been said but I do agree that we needed to respond much more quickly and in a much more meaningful way on what happened in Afghanistan, given its strategic importance to us. But even more than that I would say that the entire concept of creating a fundamentalist chain of Islamic States around the Soviet Union was worked out lay some nations a long period, so that the Soviet Union could be contained along the border but now it is a thing of the past. Now it is a thing of the past. We have enough of these States both in the Middle East and other parts of the world which are creating problems.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Alva, there is only one minute left to your party.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Okay, Madam. I know that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am saying about your party's time.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Madam, I have not taken much time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have three more names with me.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I will just funish.

Then, there is the question of Sri Lanka. I am touching upon this issue since nobody has spoken about what is happening in the north of Sri Lanka. I agree with you that we had withdrawan the IPKF from that counry. We know that internal negotiations are going on these. Recently a delegation of MPs of Tamil origin was here. The delegation pleaded with us to understand the type of problems the civilian population is facing, the type of terrorism—this is how they view it—that has been unleashed—young girls, young men and others disappear—and the type of problems they are facing, not the LTTE. Let us not identify the LTTE and the Tamil population of Northern Sri Lanka as one. I think it is a question of human tragedy and they are complaining that a whole lot of their population is kept in camps in the north of Sri Lanka. They are not allowed to move freely. They are living in absolutely the most inhuman conditions. I think this is something which you, perhaps at the informal level, should find out. Lastly I would like to make a couple of suggestions. I think it is time that the Policy Planning Group in the Foreign Ministry is constituted. You need to have people from across the board who should sit together, talk of long-term perspectives, assess the situation and be able to really plan on a long-term basis, cutting

across the party lines. The second thing is about the need for the reassertion of the political leadership in foreign affairs. I must congratulate you because you have really started working that way. But I think there is much more to be done. I would also say that a greater emphasis has to be laid on the projection of India abroad. Media is now available. The normal negative image of India which goes needs to be countered whichever way you like either, through your External Publicity Divisions or in any way that you can. I think there is a tremendous opporuntuity to do this of a secular State, of a democratic State, of elections, of the development of the economy, etc. But instead we find that it is always a negative picture which goes out. I would certainly say that a national consensus is important and has to be maintained. Here I may say what I have said in the Standing Committee that I was a little up set when Vajpayeeji had criticised our stand after our defeat in the UN General Assembly. I said to him, 'Sir, it is you who led the delegation. You could have come back to India and criticised the Government. You could have said what you wanted to say in Parliament." I was surprised when he criticised our stand in New York, just outside the UN General Assembly. We may have differences. We may have different perceptions. I think a consensus stand shoudl be taken on various issues. Such a consensus stand must be projected and must be very clearly understood by all of us. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Alva. Now, before I call the next speaker, I have some difficulty which I have to share with the House. The time allotted for this item will be over by 6.30 p.m. After this, we have clarifications on the statement made by the Minister of Railways about yesterday's accident.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Since the statement is already made, clarifications may be asked tomorrow.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time available is less than 45 minutes. Okay. Now, Shri Giri Prasad.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD (Andhra Pradesh): Before this discussion was started by our BJP friends, I was under the impression that there was a broad consensus on foreign policy matters. But after listening to the main speaker from the BJP, Prof. Malhotra, I feel that he deviated from almost every aspect of India's foreign policy. I am sorry if it is the considered opinion of that party, beacuse he was applauded by the members of that group. I am afraid we are drifting from the broad consensus that we were having.

There was a good agreement with the Chinese President recently in India. There is a broad consensus in our country and abroad also that the relations that were sore in the past between the two largest countries of the world, are getting back to normal and the differences are being sorted out. One of the most important aspects in this recent agreement is the confidence-building measures. That is also an important point. When the forces are opposite each other on the border between the two countries, some error may take place, some event may take place, that may damage the prospects of freindly relations between the two neighbours. That is why I feel and every body must feel that the agreements that have been reached by these two countries, are in the general interests of our country as also in the interest of peace and tranquility. The relations between the two countries must be preserved at any cost. And we have already gained something by this. Madam, I read it in today's newspapers perhaps that the Chinese President while speaking in Pakistan said that the dispute on Kashmir is an issue between India and Pakistan and it must be settled between the two countries; there will be no mediation from China's side. The import of that speech or approach of the Chinese President was that they wanted to be

neutral in any dispute between India and Pakistan. Till the other day, I was under the impression that China was tilting towards Pakistan, in spite of their efforts to build a good relationship with India. However, these agreements with China must lead to good relations and they must discourage the Pakistani leadership from antagonising India on various issues. That may help in brining some thaw in relations between India and Pakistan. That will be one positive result. I appeal to the BJP friends not to rake up other issues like the Tibetan issue, etc. unnecssarily. All these things were solved by history and you cannot reopen historical events by mere speeches in the Parliament. That unnecssarily vitiates the atmosphere.

The second point that I would like to mention about our relations with Pakistan is this. Smt. Alva was saying that the SAARC was the main instrument to bring about development and advancement in the region. I do agree with that. She was pointing out as to why the SAARC was not advancing during this recent period. I think it is because of the bad relations between India and Pakistan. Pakistan is not willing to solve any major dispute with our country. If the Kashmir issue, which, they say, is the bone of contention between India and Pakistan, is solved on the basis of the Shimla Agreement and Pakistan is persuaded to accept it, I feel many other problems will be solved. I think we must pay full attention to and be vigilant about the consipracies in Kahsmir, the attempts from across the border to help the terroritst, train them and send them here with arms. At the same time, we must also talk to them so as to resolve the disputes that are there between our two countries. This will help in strengthening the SAARC activities also in the region.

Recently, our Prime Minister attended a conference at Harare. From the papers that were sent to the Parliament Members and also from the reports that I read, I think our Prime Minister did well. I think he has alerted the developing countries about the activities of the developed countries, especially with regard to the forthcoming Ministerial conference of the WTO. I think he has alerted thesse developing nations, the G-15 group of countries. That was the correct approach. Though we could win the Security Council seat, we have acheieved something in the Harare Conference by uniting all these G-15 countries so that all the G-77 countries or the Non-Aligned countries or the members of WTO take a united stand with regard to unnecessary debating points that are being raised by some western countries or some developed countries. There are so many things whether it is the social clause or the investment clause, on which they are trying to consolidate their position in WTO. In the interest of developing countries, it should not be allowed. I think that is one of the major victories or major successes which our Government achieved by attending the Harare Conference. It also prepared itself and other friends for WTO conference in Singapore.

Madam, as far as Afghanistan is concerned, we must take a correct stand. I don't want to go into history. The Taliban is not only a fundamentalist force, but also exports counter-revolutionary terrorism to other countries, I have also read that they are arranging some training camps in their country to help the mercenaries to penetrate into India mainly Kashmir. That must be stopped. We must do everything to support other forces. Though there was some time gap. I think the Government has taken a correct stand.

As far as our relations with Bangladesh are concerned, they are on a good keel and the Government has done a correct thing. Our Foreign Minister and the Chief Minister of West Bengal went there. I agree with many of the points raised by my friends here. There is

another aspect of it. In order to maintain peace and bring normalcy in the North-Eastern States, our relations with Bangladesh must improve, otherewise these States will also become a problem for us. There are already some problems in these States. They have blown-off a pipeline there and they are doing may other things there. Many other events may also take place there. Terrorism has no boundaries. We have seen what happened in Ambala yesterday. These things are going to happen. So, in order to ward-off these dangers, our relations with Bangladesh must improve. I heard that the Pakistani ISI is operating through Bangladesh. Our relations with Bangladesh must improve in order to take the help of Bangladesh to curtail the activities of ISI or other agencies of Pakistan in helping the terrorists in the North-Eastern States. Whatever initiatives are taken by our Foreign Ministry and other dignitaries, must be encouraged and not to be decided in this discussion or anywhere else.

I think our defeat in the Security council is one of the main reasons for raising this debate. Of course, that is a set-back to our country, a country with one of the largest population in the world, a country which is having some prestige and friends abroad and which has deep connections with the Non-alligned countries and also a part G-77 countries. In spite of all these things, we were defeated there. I think, there must have been one reason for this defeat. Our country with unanimous approach and broad consensus of CTBT and NPT fought against the bullying tactics of America and stood like a rock. We got some prestige out of that approach. We got this prestige not only on the strength of our consensus but also on the lopsided approach which the U.S. Government was taking with regard to CTBT and NPT. But, Most of these countries which stood against the American Government on these issues, unfortunately, were presurised and they started supporting America on this issue. That is why they were signing the CTBT. They have already signed NPT. That is why they created cleavage among countries. I think, the Government should not get disheartened at the defeat of the Security Council seat. But taking lessons from this defeat, the Government must try to build up relations with all the developing countries, with all the probable friends and with all the friends of the non aligned countries so that our country's image and place in the international polity improves. By every means we must try to be a permanent member in the Security Council along with other countries like Japan and Germany. We must make every effort. This defeat must help us to review our position and consolidate our position so that our national interest is taken forward.

Only one suggestion to end. In spite of the broad consensus that is there on the foreign policy, I think, there is some deficiency on the part of the Foreign Ministry. I think, there is no proper consultation with the political parties though there is a consensus. Even on the issue of election of members to the Security Council, our Minister could have been careful. He could have invited all the parties and took their opinion about the election or withdrawing or whatever may it be. He could have placed all the facts before them so that the Opposition could have been taken into confidence, a proper decision could have been taken. Whatever it is, broadly I agree with the foreign policy steps that have been taken. Whatever deficiencies are there, I hope, will be corrected in the course of time by having a consensus, by convening all-party meetings now and then at least on this issue so that our country can have a proper national consensus on this vital issue.

Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would repeat that there is no time. It is such an important issue and in two and a half hours we are trying to discuss the entire foreign policy, and it is humanly impossible to do justice.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): Madam, I will take just five minutes. We have this Short Duration Discussion

tabled by my hon. colleagues from the BJP. Six of them have signed it. They have mentioned in their notice of the need to review our foreign policy in view of the recent failures/events. I do not know what they intend to say. If they have referred to the failure to get a non-permanent seat in the Security Council, where Vajapayeeji himself was the leader...

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: He was never a leader there...

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: I am sorry. Madam, foreign policy of this, country has been evolved with our independence. I think, it does not belong to any single political party. The first Prime Minister, Shri Nehru laid strong foundation for our foreign policy. Then we had Governments of different political parties in this country. All the Governments, including the one where Vajapayee was the Foreign Minister in 1977, stuck to that policy. I do not think there is any need to change it. I do agree that the foreign policy has taken a backseat. Maybe, we have a coalition Government here. Mr. Gujral is the lone Minister in the Ministry and he has no other colleague to assist him as a Minister of State. I think, that is the apprehension my colleagues in the BJP have. Madam, I do not think that there is anything required for us to change the policy. However, what we have faced in the Security Council, losing a non-permanent seat, I think, should not surprise us. We have faced boldly on NPT and CTBT. We have stood firmly against the pressures of the Western nuclear power club. It was expected. We anticipated that something would go against India. We even thought that the U.S. would talk about economic embargo on us. Nothing happened. But this was expected. Madam, it was also reported in the Press that Japan, being a strong financial power could muster support of 140 members.

And it was said that they could give a lot of financial aid. India could muster only 40 votes in the council. Madam, I do not think this is the main drawback for our foreign policy. It is a little aberration; it is a little irritant. But it is not a deviation from our policy. But, the Government could have done more work. As my colleague, Margaretji, has rightly pointed out, the political leadership could have been taken into confidence. I think instead of depending on the bureaucrats, leaders from various political spectra could have been used for international lobbying. Madam, I know more because I went with His Excellency the President of India and many questions were asked in those countries and our foreign policy did take a backseat. A question was put with regard to the new incumbent for the United Nations Secretary-General's post. We did not know what to say. As has rightly been pointed out by Margaretji, unless we speak of our foreign policy very loudly and not keep it in the closets, I do not think we are going to give any leadership internationally. So, it is high time that we come out openly and spoke not only for us but for other developing countries also. Madam, when the resolution went to the United Nations for ratification of the CTBT, 140 countries abstained from voting. These are the countries which belong to the NAM. I do not think that NAM has no relevance; it has great relevance because it is a unilateral world now. We can still give leadership to the NAM. I think the Government has to have a proper appraoch to involve the political leadership of these countries. As pointed out by Shri Giri Prasadji, at least, Opposition leader should be taken into confidence before any major decision is taken internationally or even in the region. Madam, again, we know that the hon. Minister made a *suo motu* statement on 27th November of Afghanistan. It is our neighbouring country and it is a country which is very much affecting the security of India. Madam, we know what is happening in Afghanistan. It is a proxy war there. We know who are fighting this war. There are two countries which recognise the Taliban regime, namely, Pakistan and the USA. Madam, if Washington gets could, Pakistan sneezes.

We know what their policy is and why they have this policy. They want to destabilise this region. The address of President Bill Clinton in 1994—I may be corrected if I am wrong—while accepting the credentials of the Ambassador of Pakistan, made a mention that Kashmir was a disputed area. I do not know what the policy of the new regime there is. Mr. Bill Clinton has been re-elected. Madam, the other day His Excellency the President of China was in this country. It was a good indication when he mentioned in our Capital city of Delhi that the dispute in Kashmir was a bilateral issue between India and Pakistan and that is came within the framework of the Shimla Agreement. I think Mr. Bill Clinton should take a lesson from his counterpart in China. I do not know why the BJP friends criticise the importance that our Government, Our Prime Minister, gave to the visiting President. Madam, the other day when you were in the Chair, my colleague, Dr. Mahesh Chandra Sharma, in the garb of welcoming the President of China, wanted to raise irritants that we had in 1962. No, doubt, as has rightly been mentioned by Dr. Biplab Dasgupta, there are irritants and irritants, but that does not mean we sever our relations because a foreign policy is to be evolved keeping in view the present circumstances. It is not only the policy of the present Government of India, but it is our national foreign policy. We have to mend our relations with our neighbours for security and prosperity. Unless political irritants are removed, you cannot develop economically.

I think most of the points have been covered by my senior colleague, Margaretji and others. Madam, here it is mentioned by the hon. Minister that the Talibans are training terrorists and these are Pakistani nationals. it is also stated that there are credible reports in the international media to this effect. We have been demanding off and on to declare Pakistan a terrorist state.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has taken up this matter internationally at the United Nations and brought it to the notice of the White House also because they are the people who had been supporting and abetting Pakistan in all the activities. Has this been brought to their notice? Madam, we have debated in this House about the Chakma refugees. This is an economic problem. This is not a political problem. The same kind of problem USA is facing with Mexico because the people of Mexico are very poor and they have a problem — economic. The USA has already signed an agreement called NAFTA agreement by which they can help Mexico. Madam, I think, we have to see the problem of Chakam refugees as an economic problem and we have to use the forum of SAARC in solving this economic problem. We have to solve the economic problem for the common benefit of both the countries of Bangladesh and India and use natural resources for the benefit of the two countries. One more thing I would like to say, as Shrimati Margaret Alva also said, is that we have to use the international channels to project India. This morning there was controversy about the map of Kashmir which has been wrongly depicted by CNN and BBC and CNN is a partner of Doordarshan. I do not know what the Government is doing, why they do not raise this issue with the Ministry of I & B. I think this is the right way because CNN is a partner of Doordarshan. I think that is the right way by which we can project our foreign policy and remove the irritants.

Thank you.

PROF. NAUNIHAL SINGH: (U.P.): Madam, Deputy Chairperson, *ab initio* I would like to point out that Professor Malhotra has spoken so nicely and pointed out a very vital issue of the border problem which was not discussed, not touched during the discussions with the Chinese President and which is being ignored even by the other hon. Members in this House. It is a matter of great

surprise to me and to all others and Madam, we are just beating about the bush. We are just showing sycophancy to the President of China, for that matter, which we have been doing for a long time. Because of that matter we have been weak and the advantage is being taken by China for that weakness and for our flattery and sycop-hancy. I endorse the very spirit and content of the speech made by Professor Malhotra. Madam, of course, I am repeating some of the points which Professor Malhotra and some other hon. Members have made. I have to say that the Government had positioned India as an authentic and fearless voice of the 113 strong nations of the Non-Aligned Movement. It is wroth nothing that India was not even the automatic choice of those countries on whose behalf it claims to speak and only less than 50% of them voted for India. it was really a dismal performance of India. Under the circumstances, the result was more than a set-back. It was averitable foreign policy disaster at the United Nations. Reputations are built not so much on heritage and history alone in these matters. We should now concentrate on building our internal strength. The days of moralising and philosophising are over. An urgent rethinking is required on many of the precepts dear to the Indian foreign policy and there are many bitter lessons to be drawn from the debacle. India lost in its diplomatic efforts which it did half-heartedly and failed miserably. To that extent I would say that India diplomacy has failed and there was no lobbying which could be considered strong, as was needed. The Ministry of External Affairs is accused of misleading signals and miscalculating the support India could muster. Besides, the hon. Minister's articulation of a policy of 'asymmetry' has attracted the criticism that India is being soft towards Pakistan.

Therefore, in order to rebut this, there is a view that India should respond with a degree of detached realism when dealing with the current regime in Pakistan.

Pakistan's latest overture has to be couter-weighted with President Farooq Leghari's pronouncement a few weeks ago that Pakistan would sustain 'its moral, political and displomatic support for the cause of the Kashmiri people. The Ministry of External Affairs has reacted to it with its usual caution — 'Wait and watch'.

Madam, however, it is construed by the Ministry of External Affairs' insiders and Pakistan watchers that there is unlikely to be any dramatic shift in Pakistan's hostile stance towards India. The latest episode—this is known to everybody—however, went beyond the bounds of morality and international conventions. This was the incident where Mr. Ashok Wahi and his wife were beaten up and expelled, adding insult to injury.

All these incidents which have happened make us believe that 'enough is enough' and it could result in snapping our diplomatic ties with Pakistan. The hon. Minister's response was 'saintly'. He said: 'We will be forced to review the gamut of our relations with them, unless we get a satisfactory reply' he whined. Pakistan's reply was: 'The concern expressed by the Indian Foregin Office is misplaced.'

Madam, it has been proved conclusively for over fifty years now that whoever comes into office in Pakistan has to maintain a certain posture *vis-a-vis* India. Pakistan has to continue its policy of confrontation towards India. Nobody hoped for a miraculous improvement in relations.

Besides, the hon. Minister had gone on record that India should have a 'saintly' attitude towards our neighbour. He wants to ease visa restrictions unilaterally, presenting them wholesale at the airports. The security implications of this dotty proposal are frightening. Of course, he is but following the lead of his colleague in the Defence Ministry. In Parliament, Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav made light of Pakistani infiltration. He said: 'They are

our brothers, and there is nothing if brothers return home'. I would like to point out that according to Gita:

"शठे शाठ्यम् समाचरेत"।

'Treat the wicked with wickedness'. 'Offence is the first defence' - this should be the basis of our foreign policy. But unfortunately, India practices a policy of lying down and let Pakistan trample over it. If this is the kind of diplomacy followed by India, I have nothing to say.

Madam, it is very shocking to see that the policy followed from the time of Independence is being given up. Nehru based his foreign policy on the preservations of India's global interests. His foreign policy principles were unchanging. National security was constant in Nehru's thinking. But we find that there is now a shift. The emphasis is only on regional problems when we must look at the problems on a global basis.

The longest eclipse of our independent foreign policy came during Narasimha Rao's regime. Rao told his partymen that NAM had ceased to be a force after the changes in Yugoslavia, that India would never be suservient to or 'sit in the lap of any country', that it would not tolerate arm-twisting. Soon after making this bewildering statement, he consciously steered the country's foreign policy towards getting into the good books of the United States. His Government sought and abided by the advice of the U.S.-centric World Bank/IMF combine, opened all doors, windows and ventilators to the MNCs., and sought foreign investment at any cost. This was obviously not the way other nations invited foreign investment; not the way China did: not even on the basis of the elementary cost-benefit calculations that guide the neighbourhood 'bania'. The so-called liberalisation was done entirely in a posture of prostration. The result was: an array of inessential investments were made.

Result: This once-respected nation, this once-leader of the largest international alliance NAM is today, by the large, friendless. Result: Just three nations supported our principled and absolutely correct stand on CTBT. And no more than 40 supported our bid for temporary membership of the Security Council. And this when we are seeking a permanent status there! The Foreign Minister has come in for considerable flak in the security Council rout. In fact, I must confess to being surprised that we received as many as 40 votes. Obviously, countires other than Bhutan and Mauritius and a few constant faithfuls, bless them, voted for us. Besides, Russia, China and France also supported India. I am not sarcastic when I say that this is no mean achievement considering the shambles our foreign policy has been in for many years now. this is why the hon. Minister's advocacy of a "saintly approach" to Pakistan fails to make sense. But when some nation acts against our interests, as Pakistan has done all along and is still doing, then we must take a no-nonsense stand and tell such Governments where they get off.

The recent warning to Islamabad to behave or we will "review the whole gamut of our relations" should have come a long time ago, when Pakistan started the bloody upheaval in Kashmir, which coincided with the first innings of the hon. Minister. Now that he is there again, he must not encourage the belief in Pakistan that no matter what they do vis-a-vis this country we will neither bark nor bite, that even a strongish protest over what they did to our Embassy staffer came only on second thoughts. Madam, if India is to be taken seriously in international fora as well as by individual foreign Governments, them it must take itself seriously first. This means paying more attention to foreign affairs and to the closely-related matter of national defence which continues to stand neglected.

It is a matter of ceasing to grope in the dusk, of giving up ad hoc initiatives and reactions, of intelligently identifying our

true national interests, our security concerns, our economic priorities-and then evolving an appropriate foreign policy and making it clearly and widely known to friends and foes all over the world. The more we assert and exercise our independence, the better it will be for our crippled self-esteem, and the more friends we will make.

Thanking you, Madam.

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म खान (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदया, हमारे कई विद्वान साथी बहुत अच्छा बोल चुके हैं और अगर सच्चाई से कहा जाए तो श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी जी ने जितनी अच्छी तरह से मामले को रखा है, उसके बाद कोई बहुत ज्यादा कहने की जरूरत और यूं भी देश में हमारी सरकारों को चलाने वाले लोगों में गुजराल साहब का नाम ऐसे ही लोगों में आता है, जिनके बारे में कम से कम देश में अभी तक यह मान्यता है कि फॉरेन पॉलिसी में गल्तियां तो होंगी, इंसान है, लेकिन कोशिश रहती है कि अच्छी साख रहे देश की, देश के अंदर और देश के बाहर, लेकिन हमारे भारतीय जनता पार्टी के साथियों ने, जिन्होंने शुरूआत की फॉरेन पॉलिसी पर-देश की पॉलिसी के बाद अब फॉरेन पॉलिसी पर भी बात करते हैं, खुशी होती है सुनकर—चीन का मुद्दा बहुत गर्म रहा आपके दिमाग पर और उसी से उन्होंने शुरूआत की है। यही सही है कि अगर कोई हमारी जमीन हड़प ले, कोई हमारी जेब का माल निकाल ले तो हमारा यह मुताबला रहना चाहिए, मांग रहनी चाहिए कि वह चीज हमें वापिस मिल जाए, उसे मांगते रहने में ..(**व्यवधान**)..

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: क्या आपने उठाया है इस मामले को? ..(**व्यवधान**)..

उपसभापति: उन्हें बोलने तो दीजिए।

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: आपने इसे बैठक में क्यों नहीं उठाया?

उपसभापति: देखिए, जब कोई बोल रहा हो और उसको आप डॉयरेक्ट करें कि आप यह बोलिए या वह बोलिए तो वह कभी आपकी बात नहीं मानेगा। उन्हें वही बोलने दीजिए जो वह बोलना चाह रहे हैं, अपनी बात क्यों थोप रहे हैं आप?

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म खान: मैडम, मजाज़ का एक शेर सुन लीजिए-

"कुछ तुझको खबर है हम क्या-क्या ऐ शोरिशे दौरा भूल गए,
वह जुल्फे परेशां भूल गए, वह दीदा-ए-गिरियां भूल गए,
सबका तो मदावा कर डाला, अपना ही मदावा कर न सके,
सबके तो गरेबां सी डाले, अपना ही गरेबां भूल गए"

अगर अपना गरेबां याद रखा होता तो बहुत से ऐसे सवाल है जिनका जवाब हमें खुद ही मिल गया होता। हम हिंदुस्तान के बाहर जब अपनी साख तलाश करें तो कुछ चीजें ऐसी हैं जो अपने आप से हमें पूछनी होंगी। फॉरेन पालिसी को अगर हम मोटे अलफाज़ में कहें तो हम बाहर के देशों से क्या हासिल कर सकते हैं और बाहर के देशों से हमें क्या हासिल होता है, यही फॉरेन पालिसी का मकसद है। यह उसी वक्त मुमकिन है जब हमारे अंदरूनी हालात अच्छे हों, हमारी इकनॉमिक कंडीशन अच्छी हो। अभी एक बात यहां आई, मैं उन मोहतरमा का नाम नहीं लूंगा, वे जल्दी नाराज़ हो जाती हैं, उन्होंने बगैर नाम लिए हुए मुलायम सिंह जी पर कटाक्ष किया और देश की फौजी हालात को उन्होंने बड़ा कमजोर बताया है। इस कमजोर हालात का अगर कोई जिम्मेदार है तो उसको पहले अपनी जिम्मेदारी माननी चाहिए, महसूस करनी चाहिए। जिन्होंने सबसे ज्यादा दिनों तक इस देश पर राज किया है, उन्ही की सबसे बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है उन्हें ही बड़ा शिकवा है कहा गया कि मुलायम सिंह यादव डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री में कम और उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्यमंत्री बनने में ज्यादा दिलचस्पी रखते हैं। जब कि यह आज के डिस्कशन का मुद्दा नहीं है। श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव का नाम आएगा तो कुछ लोग ऐसे होंगे जिन्हें जागते समय कम और सोते समय ज्यादा उनकी तस्वीर नज़र आती होगी।

महोदया, चीन से ताल्लुकात अच्छे हों, यह हालात की मजबूरी भी है और वक्त की जरूरत भी और इसलिए भी जरूरी है कि अगर हमारा अपने पड़ोसी से झगड़ा हो तो या तो हम अपने आपको मजबूत

करें या फिर पड़ोसी को कमजोर करें और अगर दोनों चीजें न हो सकती हों तो फिर ऐसे हालात पैदा करें जिसमें पड़ोसी के साथ अच्छे माहौल में रहने का माहौल बन सकता हो। हम बहुत दूर की बातें न करें, हम बड़े देशों के साथ फॉरेन पालिसी के ऐडजस्टमेंट की बात न करें, सार्क सम्मिट में क्या हुआ, नॉन-ऐलाइंड मूवमेंट में क्या हुआ, इसकी बहस में जाए बगैर अगर हम 4 पड़ोसी देशों के बारे में सोच लें कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे रिश्ते कैसे हों, नेपाल के साथ हमारे रिश्ते कैसे हों, श्रीलंका के साथ हमारे रिश्ते कैसे हों, बंगला देश के साथ हमारे रिश्ते कैसे हों, इस पर अगर हमारी नज़र चली जाए तो यह ज्यादा अच्छा होगा।

बंगला देश के बारे में अभी यहां बात आई। फॉरेन पालिसी की बुनियाद कूटनीति पर होती है और कूटनीति का मतलब होता है कि हम जो चाहते हैं, हमारा देश जैसा चाहता है, वैसी फॉरेन पालिसी अमल में लाएं और कोई देश उसको समझ न सके। अगर हमारी कूटनीति की पोल खुल जाए और वह पकड़ी जाए तो वह कूटनीति नहीं रह जाती। पाकिस्तान के कैसे दो हिस्से हुए, बंगला देश कैसे बना, अगर हमारी फौज के जनरल उसकी कहानी लिखना शुरू कर दें और पूरी दुनिया में इस पर किताबें बेची जाने लगें तो यह कूटनीति नहीं है बल्कि देश के साथ धोखा है।

अफगानिस्तान के साथ हमारे रिश्ते कैसे हों, ईरान के साथ हमारे रिश्ते कैसे हों, इस बारे में आज के हालात में एक नीति हो सकती है और आज से 10 साल बाद दूसरी नीति हो सकती है। एक दिन वह भी था जब ईरान में इंकबाल आया और शाह को सत्ता छोड़नी पड़ी। उस वक्त हिंदुस्तान के ईरान के साथ अच्छे रिश्ते नहीं थे। अयातुल्ला खोमेनी मूवमेंट को हमारे देश में सपोर्ट नहीं किया गया, यह किसी के लिए सही और किसी के लिए गलत हो सकता है लेकिन आज उनके साथ हमारे अच्छे रिश्ते हैं, अच्छे ताल्लुकात हैं। पहले अफगानिस्तान हमसे हर बात में मशविरा करता था, हो सकता है कि उसकी अपनी कुछ कमजोरियां रही हों लेकिन आज हम राज्यसभा में बैठकर इस बात का शिकवा कर रहे है कि अफगानिस्तान हमसे कुछ पूछता नहीं, राय नहीं लेता। आज तो हालत यह है कि उससे हमारी अखंडता को खतरा खड़ा हो रहा है, एक ऐसे देश से जिसका मामूली सा वजूद है, सिवाय इसके कि वह अपने लोगों पर बम फेंकता है, उसकी फौजें एक-दूसरे पर अपने ही हम वतनों पर आग उगलती हैं।

इसके अलावा उसकी कोई हैसियत नहीं है। हमें थोड़ा अपने बारे में सोचना होगा कि अफगानिस्तान जैसा मुल्क जिसकी कोई अपनी ताकत नहीं है, जिसकी कोई हैसियत नहीं है वह हमारे देश में आग लगाने का काम करता है। वह कश्मीर के अंदर फसाद पैदा करता है और हम उसे रोक नहीं पाते। यह भी एक सवाल है। फॉरेन पॉलिसी हमारी क्या है? देश की सरहदों पर हमारी क्या चौकसी है इसके बारे में भी बहरहाल हमें ही सोचना होगा। बाहर के लोग इसके बारे में नहीं सोचेंगे। मैंने शुरू में सही कहा था कि बड़े विद्वान साथी हमारे इस इश्यू पर बोल चुके हैं। लेकिन इतना जरूर कहूंगा कि बाहर की दुनियां में अपनी साख बनाने के लिए बाहर के देशों में अपनी साख बनाने के लिए सबसे ज्यादा जरूरी यह होगा कि बाहर के देश हमारी साख को तसलीम करने के लिए तैयार भी हों, वह हमारी फॉरेन पालिसी से अपनी फॉरेन पॉलिसी का कोई मिलान कर सकें और उसके लिए बुनियादी जरूरत इस बात की होगी कि खुद हम अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों और खुद हमारा अपना चरित्र भी ऐसा हो, खुद हमारी अपनी अंदरूनी साख ऐसी हो कि कम से कम दूर के देश न सही, अमीरिका न सही, बरतानिया न सही, रूस न सही लेकिन हमारे चार पड़ौसी देश हमसे ऐसा जरूर रिश्ता रखें जिससे हम दूर की दुनियां में तो अपनी फॉरेन पौलिसी को कामयाब नहीं बना सके लेकिन पड़ौस के चार देशों में कामयाब बना सके। एक पहल हुई थी जनता पार्टी की सरकार के जामने में आपके ही मंत्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेई साहब ने।

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: आपके भी मंत्री थे।

श्री मोहम्मद आज़म खान: यकीनन हमारे भी थे, उस वक्त हमारे भी थे। जब तक वह अच्छे थे हमारे भी थे और जब समाज को जलाने का काम करने लगे तब हमारे ही नहीं बल्कि करोड़ों, इंसानों के वह नहीं रहे और ठीक इस तरह एक मामूली सी चिंगारी जो पूरे समाज के लिए रोशनी का काम कर सकती है और वही एक चिंगारी पूरे सामज को जलाने का भी काम कर सकती है। अटल बिहारी वाजपेई साहब ने जब उस चिंगारी से रोशनी का काम लेना चाहा तब उसने रोशनी करने का काम किया और जब जलाने का काम लेना चाहा तो छः दिसम्बर जैसा दिन भी इस देश में आया। बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): Madam, I am only seeking a clarification. I am not making a speech. Before seeking clarifications, Madam, let me dissociate myself from the observation

made by the hon. Member of the ruling alliance about the neighbouring countries like Nepal and Ceylon which are small countries. We are not their big brother. We should not adopt such an attitude towards our neighbouring countries, big or small. It is not fair on the part of any one of us to make such an observation.

Now, Madam, I come to the clarificaitons I seek from the hon. Minister. As already said, the importance of the international fora is shifting from New York to Geneva. Political issues have gone back and economic issues have come to the fore-front as already put forth. by Shri Pranab Mukherjee. The World Trade Organization is taking the central stage. In this background, I want only one clarification. The Indian Foreign Service is a watertight compartment of bureaucrats in this country. The Indian Mission is also a private co-operative of this Foreign Service. I want to know from the hon. Minsiter what plans they are contemplating to change the attitude, the approach, the method of functioning in a diplomatic way in different parts of the world, of our Missions. Are you having any kind of idea and plan? If not, please think on those terms, of approaching other nations.

Secondly, definitely we also welcome the steps taken to improve the relations with the Chinese Government. The President's visit is very good. But there should not be any complacent attitude. We have to improve our relations with the Chinese more. At the same time, we have to persuade them. Paper reports say that China is the biggest supplier of arms and ammunition to Pakistan. It supplies more than America does. The missile technology and the very modern weapon technology have been transferred from Beijing to Islamabad. It is of great concern to this country, to our national interest. How to persuade them? Use this opportunity of the visit of the President any improve the relations better and use the good offices of the Foreign Affairs Ministry of the Government of India to persuade them not to escalate the tension in this Sub-Continent giving more and more arms and ammunition and transferring weapon technologies which will improve their capabilities in the field of production of missiles and other weapons. In view of the foregoing submissions, what initiative is the Government going to take in future? Thank you.

श्री संजय निरूपम (महाराष्ट्र): मैं इस सदन का सबसे जूनियर सदस्य हूं।

उपसभापति: उम्र में या टाइम में?

श्री संजय निरूपम: उम्र में भी और टाइम में भी।

उपसभापति: अच्छा उम्र बता दीजिए।

श्री संजय निरूपम: महोदया, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय रिलेशन्स मेरा विषय रहा है और मैं उसका स्टूडेंट रहा हूं। फॉरेन पॉलिसी पर क्योंकि यहां चर्चा चल रही है तो मैं चाह रहा था कि मैं ज़रूर उसमें हिस्सा लूं लेकिन मुझे बहुत दुख हुआ जिस तरह से यहां पर बातें हो रही थीं। उन सबको सुनकर मुझे बहुत दुख हुआ कि जिस तरह नेशनल पोलिटिक्स के सीन पर सारी पार्टियां अपने-अपने स्तर पर एकजुट हो कर बी॰जे॰पी॰ को आईसोलेट कर रही हैं बिलकुल उसी तरह फॉरेन पॉलिसी के प्रश्न पर भी तमाम पार्टियां बी॰जे॰पी॰ को आईसोलेट कर रही हैं।

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Madam, is he referring to the domestic policy?

SHRI SANJAY NIRUPAM: No, no. This is regarding the foreign policy. Just listen to me. आपके आने से पहले यहां पर एक प्रश्न उठा था कि वेस्ट बंगाल के चीफ मिनिस्टर ज्योति बसु बंगलादेश जा सकते हैं या नहीं जा सकते हैं? वहां जाकर उन्हें क्या बात करनी चाहिए और क्या बात नहीं करनी चाहिए। प्रणब बाबू ने यह मुद्दा यहां रखा और अपने विचार इस तरह से रखे कि उन्होंने एक ऑल पार्टी मीट बुलाई थी और उस ऑल पार्टी मीट में बी॰जे॰पी॰ को नहीं बुलाया गया था। उसके लिए कुछ टेक्नीकेलिटीज़ बताई गई थीं, एक आधार बताया गया था लेकिन मुझे लगता है कि इस आधार पर विश्वास करने के बजाय भारतीय जनता पार्टी जो कि इस देश की एक बहुत बड़ी पार्टी है, उस पार्टी की भी राय ली जानी चाहिए थी उस ऑल पार्टी मीट में क्योंकि वहां ज्योति बसु सिर्फ वेस्ट बंगाल को रिप्रेज़ेंट नहीं कर रहे थे. वे वहां

पूरे देश को रिप्रेज़ेंट करने जा रहे थे तो सबसे पहले मैं चाह रहा हूं कि इस बात का क्लोरिफिकेशन हो जाना चाहिए। अब ज्योति बसु के अलावा इससे पहले कौन-कौन से लोग कहां-कहां गए हैं बतौर मुख्य मंत्री, यह एक बहस का मुद्दा है और इसका निष्कर्ष बहुत जल्दी हम नहीं निकाल सकते। मेरा कहने का मतलब सिर्फ यह है कि फॉरेन पॉलिसी को लेकर हमारी सरकार हमेशा एक दुलमुल नीति अपनाती है। मैडम, हमारी जो फॉरेन पॉलिसी है उसकी धार एकदम भोथरी हो गई है। मैं यहां फॉरेन पॉलिसी के जिस आस्पेक्ट पर बात करना चाह रहा हूं, वह सिर्फ पाकिस्तान से जुड़ा हुआ है। चीन और अन्य सारे देशों से जो जुड़ा हुआ विषय है, उस पर बातचीत हो चुकी है। मैं पाकिस्तान के संदर्भ में पूछना चाहता हूं अपने विदेश मंत्री महोदय से कि पिछले दिनों वे न्यूयार्क गए थे और उन्होंने वहां पाकिस्तानियों की एक बैठक संबोधित की और उस बैठक में पाकिस्तानियों से कहा कि अगर आपको वीसा मिलने में कोई प्रॉब्लम हो रही है तो आप फैक्स पर हमसे वीसा ले सकते हैं।

श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजरालः मैंने कोई मीटिंग पाकिस्तानियों को एड्रेस नहीं की है।

श्री संजय निरूपमः ऐसी खबर आ चुकी है, मैं आपको क्लिपिंग भी दिखा दूंगा। मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि आखिर पाकिस्तानी व्यापारियों को, पाकिस्तानी सिटिज़न्स को ....(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजरालः बिलकुल गलत है। अगर आप स्टूडेंट हैं तो आप अखबार ठीक से पढ़ा कीजिए। आप कह रहे हैं कि आप स्टूडेंट हैं ...मैंने कभी कोई पाकिस्तानियों की मीटिंग एड्रेस नहीं की।

उपसभापतिः उन्होंने कह दिया कि झूठी खबर है, बात खत्म हो गई।

श्री संजय निरूपमः अच्छा तो ठीक है। आप यह बात तो स्पष्ट करें कि क्या पाकिस्तानियों को वीसा देने के लिए हमारी सरकार कुछ विशेष सहूलियत देने जा रही है?

श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजरालः यह और बात है, इस बात को अलग करिए उस बात से। पहले वे लफ्ज़ वापस, लीजिए कि मैंने पाकिस्तानियों को एड्रेस किया है।

श्री संजय निरूपमः सर, मैं यह इसलिए पूछ रहा हूं कि हमारे जो लोग वहां से अपने देश आना चाहते हैं, उन्हें वीसा देने में अकसर परेशान किया जाता है।

श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजरालः अब यह अलग सवाल है, आप इसको अलग करिए। दो सवालों को अलग करिए।

उपसभापतिः अभी आप बोलिए। सवाल-जवाब नहीं हो रहे हैं यहां। आपने एक बात कही थी कि उन्होंने पाकिस्तानियों की कोई मीटिंग एड्रेस की तो इससे पहले कि आप उस पर आगे विचार-विमर्श करें, उन्होंने कह दिया कि मैंने मीटिंग एड्रेस नहीं की ताकि उस विषय पर ....(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री संजय निरूपमः लेकिन आपने ऐसी बात तो कही थी उनसे। आपने ऐसी राय तो प्रकट की थी कि फैक्स से पाकिस्तानियों को वीसा दिया जाएगा। ....(**व्यवधान**).... मैडम, मैं ये सारी बातें इसलिए कह रहा हूं ....(**व्यवधान**)....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA : Madam, is it a cross-examination?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. I can handle it. संजय जी, यहां आप अपना भाषण कीजिए। जब मंत्री जी जवाब देंगे ....(**व्यवधान**)....

श्री संजय निरूपमः मैडम, भाषण तो यहां बहुत सारा हो चुका है। मैं भाषण नहीं करना चाह रहा हूं।

उपसभापतिः सभी भाषण कर रहे हैं। जवाब किसी का वे आज देंगे नहीं।.... (**व्यवधान**)...

श्री संजय निरूपमः मैं मुद्दे पर बात करना चाह रहा हूं मैडम।

उपसभापतिः आप मुद्दे पर बोलिए मगर सवाल जवाब मत करिए। आपने जो पूछना है, आप पूछते रहिए। वे बाद में सबका इकट्ठा जवाब देंगे। यह तो आपका समय जा रहा है, मैं तो घंटी बजा दूंगी।

श्री संजय निरूपमः मडैम, मेरी राय यह है कि मुम्बई जो कि हमारी फिल्म इंडस्ट्री का बहुत बड़ा सेन्टर है वहां पर बहुत सारे पाकिस्तानी कलाकार आते हैं, फिल्मों में काम करते हैं लेकिन मैडम, वह फिल्मों में काम कम करते हैं और वह आईएसआई के लिए जासूसी ज्यादा करते हैं। ये सिर्फ मेरी राय नहीं है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, what is this? I have a strong objection to this. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, this is not correct. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHNU KANT SHASTRI: Let

him complete. ...(*Interruptions*)... Let him complete.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: This is too much. ...(*Interruptions*)... This is too much. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Madam, he is deviating from the issue.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्रीः उनको अपना बयान ...(**व्यवधान**)... इनको आपत्ति करने का क्या हक है... (**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभापतिः आप बैठिए न। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री राघवजीः यह सही बात है। आप सुनिए ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्रीः इनको आपत्ति करने का कोई हक नहीं है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभापतिः आप बैठिए। संजय जी मुम्बई को रिप्रजेन्ट करते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, this is to be removed. ...(*interruptions*)...

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्रीः आप कैसे कर सकते है? ...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री संजय निरूपमः जब आपको मौका मिलेगा तब बोलिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: The rule is very clear, Madam. Rule 238 is very clear on this. ...(*interruptions*)... Madam, I am on a point of order. ...(*interruptions*)... Rule 238: No allegation shall be made; "Provided that the Chairman May at any time prohibit any Member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the Council." ...(*Interruptions*)...

उपसभापतिः आप चेयर पर हैं या मैं? मुझे सुनने दीजिए। ....(**व्यवधान**)....

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: How can the hon. Member made such an allegation? ....*(Interruptions)*.... Madam, the hon. Member is making an allegation; he is lowering the standards of the House. ....*(Interruptions)*....

श्री संजय निरूपमः मैडम, मेरी बात सुनिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)... मैडम, मेरी बात सुनिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : How can the hon. Member make such an allegation? ...(*interruptions*)... He can go with Michael Jackson! ...(*interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Vayalar Ravi, just one second. ...(*interruptions*)... Just one second, please.

श्री संजय निरूपमः मैडम, देखिए यह कितनी शर्म की बात है कि पाकिस्तानी कलाकारों के लिए यह लोग लड़ रहे हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभापतिः नहीं। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: This is highly objectionable. This has to be expunged. ...(*interruptions*)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, this is objectionable. This should be expunged. ...(*interruptions*)...

उपसभापतिः शास्त्री जी, जरा बैठिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I am on a point of order. My point of order is that no Member in the House can, while speaking, insinuate against the others. He is a New Member; he should kindly read the rules. ...(*interruptions*)... He has no right to insinuate. ...(*interruptions*)... He can't insinuate. ...(*interruptions*)...

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्रीः कलाकारों का कुछ नहीं होता है। (**व्यवधान**)... कोई कलाकार गलत काम करेगा, आईएसआई के लिए काम करेगा तो ...(**व्यवधान**)...

उपसभापतिः शास्त्री जी, आप बैठिए। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, it has been said, and it is a matter of shame, that some people are acting as agents of Pakistani artists ...(*interruptions*)...

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ताः उनको बोलने का हक है। ....(**व्यवधान**)... आपको बचाने की जरूरत नहीं है। ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will look into the record. ...(*interruptions*)...

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: जो आईएसआई के लिए काम कर रहे हैं, वही कलाकार के रूप में आते हैं। ...(**व्यवधान**)....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)... Sit down, sit down. ...(*Interruptions*)... **अच्छा आप बैठिए।** ...(*Interruptions*)...

PROF. RAM KAPSE: Madam, it is his maiden speech.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not maiden. ...(*Interruptions*)... Just one second. ...(*Interruptions*)... Can we have some peace so that I can speak to the Members?

उपसभापति: इस हाउस में या किसी भी हाउस में, ख़ासतौर से हमारे हाउस में हम यह कोशिश करते हैं कि कोई भी अगर एलीगेशन किसी पर लगाये, कुछ भी बोले, उसको सब्स्टेंशिएट करें। अगर आपके पास इस तरह का कोई सबूत है और जिन आर्टिस्ट के बारे में आप कह रहे हैं, उन्होंने कोई इस तरह की एक्टीविटी करी है तो मुझे यकीन है कि सरकार कभी किसी को प्रोटेक्शन नहीं देती है। ...(**व्यवधान**)... सुनिए, सुनिए मेरी बात सुन लीजिए। आप पूरी बात सुन लीजिए। बीच में मत दखल दीजिए। कोई भी सरकार, किसी भी फौरन कंट्री के लोगों को जो गलत कार्रवाई करते हों उनको कभी गलत प्रोटेक्शन नहीं देगी। अगर आपकी जानकारी में ऐसा मैटर है तो आप सब्स्टेंशिएट करिये। खाली एलिगेशन लगाने पर इन लोगों को एतराज है। आप सब्स्टेंशिएट कर सकते हैं। अगर कोई सबूत है तो जरूर बताइये।...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, सबसे पहले मैं उसी मुद्दे पर आ रहा हूं। मेरा यह आरोप नहीं है।

उपसभापति: यह आरोप नहीं है तो बोलिये।

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मुम्बई पुलिस की स्पैशल ब्रान्च ने पाकिस्तानी दो लड़कियों, अनीता अयूब और जेबा बख्तियार के खिलाफ जासूसी के आरोप में रिपोर्ट दर्ज कराई है।...(व्यवधान) आज वहां कोई भी...(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: वह रिपोर्ट कहां है? (*Interruptions*)... What is this? Let me find out. I am trying to help. (*Interruptions*)... Let me find out. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मुझे अपनी बात कम्पलीट कर लेने दीजिए। पाकिस्तानी कलाकारों को मुम्बई से हम लोगों ने भगा दिया है। मैं यह इसलिए कह रहा हूं ...(**व्यवधान**)

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, they can invite Jackson and make money. (*Interruptions*)... It is a shame. It is a disgrace to Mumbai. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मैं वही कहने जा रहा हूं...(**व्यवधान**) मैडम, मेरी बात कम्पलीट नहीं हुई है। मैडम, उन्होंने यह बात रखी है कि पाकिस्तानी कलाकारों का आईएसआई के एजेंटों से फौरन पालिसी का क्या नाता है, इसलिए उन लोगों ने बहुत शोर मचाया और अपनी बात रखी। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि पाकिस्तानी कलाकारों को मुम्बई में अक्सर इस तरह की जासूसी हरकतें करते हुए मुम्बई पुलिस ने पाया है। मुम्बई पुलिस ने उनके खिलाफ एक्शन लिया, जिससे डरकर वे लोग भागे। इसलिए मैंने कहा कि मुम्बई से डराकर उन्हें भगाया है। आज वहां कोई पाकिस्तानी कलाकार काम नहीं करता है। (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. Please don't interrupt. (*Interruptions*)... Please don't interrupt. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: माइकल जैक्शन आया तो उसने कहा कि सबसे प्यारा हिन्दुस्तान ...(**व्यवधान**) अनीता अयूब ने तो ऐसा कभी नहीं बोला ...(**व्यवधान**)

THE DPEUTY CHAIRMAN: please order. (*Interruptions*)...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: What has this to do with the foreign policy? (*Interruptions*)... What has this to do with the foreign policy? (*Interruptions*)... This is relating to national security. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: यह क्या बात है ...(व्यवधान) आप फैसला नहीं कर सकते ...(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: आप बैठिये I have to finish the discussion अगर आपके पास यह इन्फार्मेशन है तो आपको इसे सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट को देना चाहिये। यहां होम मिनिस्टर साहब भी बैठे हैं। खाली पार्लियामेंट में बोलने से आपकी बात का समाधान नहीं होगा। अगर आपको इतनी इन्फर्मेशन थी कि उनको भगा दिया तो यह बात होम मिनिस्टर साहब को, सबको पता होनी चाहिये।

श्री संजय निरूपम: उनको पता है, लेकिन वे कहना नहीं चाहते हैं। यह बात मैं आपके सामने कह रहा हूं।

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJARAL): We cannot take this allegation very lightly. (*Interruptions*)... He has made an allegation. "आपको पता है, ये जानना नहीं चाहते" टोटली ये बात गलत है...**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभापति: मंत्री जी बोल रहे हैं, आप बैठिये। Please sit down. The Minister is on his legs. Please sit down.

श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल: महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट की ड्यूटी है और यह उसको करना चाहिये। अगर पुलिस के पास कोई रिपोर्ट है तो उनको भेजना उनकी ड्यूटी है और रिस्पॉसीबिलिटी है। अगर उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं किया तो कोताही की है...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, यह पता लगाने की बात है कि महाराष्ट्र सरकार ने इनको...**(व्यवधान)** मैं आपके सामने यह आश्वासन देता हूं की इसकी जानकारी प्राप्त करके सदन के पटल पर रखूंगा। मैडम पाकिस्तानी कलाकारों से जुड़ा हुआ जो विषय था उसके बारे में कहने का मेरा मकसद सिर्फ यही है कि सबसे पहले पाकिस्तानी कलाकारों के हिन्दुस्तान में काम करने, नाचने-गाने पर बैन कर देना चाहिये। मेरा सबसे पहला सवाल यह है...**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभापति: उनकी अपनी मर्जी है, उनको बोलने दीजिए...**(व्यवधान)** Everybody has a right to put his viewpoint. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, मेरा दूसरा मुद्दा यह है कि जब दक्षिण अफ्रीका में रंगभेद का प्रश्न चल रहा था तो दक्षिण अफ्रीका को पूरी तरह से आइसोलेट कर दिया गया था यहां तक कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका की टीम के साथ किसी ने क्रिकेट नहीं खेला बिल्कुल उसी तरह से हमें पाकिस्तानी टीम के साथ क्रिकेट नहीं खेलना चाहिये। ...**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him speak. (*Interruptions*)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: यह फॉरेन पालिसी का एक हिस्सा है ...**(व्यवधान)**

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is his ten minutes' time which I have given him.

श्री संजय निरूपम: मैडम, यह तो सिर्फ एक चीज का उदाहरण है। मेरे कहने का मतलब सिर्फ इतना है कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमें किसी भी तरह का रिश्ता नहीं रखना चाहिये। न कूटनीतिक रिश्ता रखना चाहिए, किसी भी तरह का रिश्ता नहीं रखना चाहिए। जम्मू-कश्मीर के बारे में बार-बार कहा जाता है कि उसके साथ वाइलेटरल वार्ता होनी चाहिए, द्विपक्षीय वार्ता होनी चाहिए। मेरा मानना है कि कश्मीर हमारा है और कश्मीर के बारे में फैसला हमें करना है। पाकिस्तान का उससे कोई लेना-देना नहीं है। कश्मीर के संदर्भ में पाकिस्तान से कोई बात नहीं करनी चाहिए। मैडम, सिर्फ इतनी बात कहकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Manisha Koirala has been banned by Bal Thackeray...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री संजय निरूपम: मनीषा कोइराला ने यह कहा था कि अगर बाला साहेब अनुमति दें तो ...**(व्यवधान)** और बाला साहेब ने कहा था कि मनीषा कोइराला देशभक्त है, वह अपने आप फैसला करे। ...**(व्यवधान)**... मनीषा कोइराला ने फिर पाकिस्तानी फिल्म में काम करने से मना कर दिया था।

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Why should Bal Thackeray give permission? who is he? Is he the Government?

SHRI SANJAY NIRUPAM: He always talks about the nation.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Who is Bal Thackeray?

श्री संजय निरूपम: आप जाकर मनीषा कोइराला से यह सवाल पूछिए। उनके सामने यह क्यों नहीं रखा जाता?

DR. B. B. DUTTA (Nominated): Madam, many stalwarts have spoken before me. I am afraid I will not be able to be as appreciative of the foreign policy as many of the stalwarts have been. I strongly believe that it is high time we reformulate our foreign policy. It was a bipolar world in which Nehru had enunciated his policy. He carried it on very nicely with a lot of good results. He championed many things we so dearly cherish. But as Mr Mukherjee has said, the world has become militarily unipolar but economically multipolar. In such a canvas, the old concept of non-alignment does not give us enough handle to operate. Even if we are for non-alingment, we will have to play a new role. We have to take a different attitude. But this is the kind of orientation that is exactly not being given. A foreign policy must have some substantive objectives—first, the question of security; second, it must help us in our economic advancement, in our economic development, ensure the flow of aid, trade and investment and third, the foreign policy must strengthen our domestic politicial process and goals. I would first like to invite the attention of the hon. Foreign Minister to the question of security. There is, as I admit, a national consensus that India should not sign the CTBT; and in the process let us admitted /we have got isolated. It is equally true that we have decided that we will not go nuclear? Is it equally true that the nation has decided this? Will the hon. Foreign Minister tell the House today that the national consensus is that we should not go nuclear? It is very hazy. As a common man, we find that there is a graving belief that India is capable of going nuclear in one day. "Don't worry about it. Don't talk about it. India can go nuclear in one day." This is the kind of assurance that is being whispered and it is doing its rounds in gossips. If this is so, then we must presume that simulation technology is available with us. Because only then can we go nuclear in one day. That means we can acquire nuclear capability. This is the technology which even the most advanced countries in the world are not having. Russia is not having it. Russia was promised by America that they would get it. Now they fear they will not get it and they are threatening that they will not sign CTBT. Now if we have one or two super computers that does not mean that we have got this technology because a country in order to have a simulation technology has to go on testing it has to feed the computer with data and then go for permutations and combinations. So how do you believe that we have got the capacity to go nuclear in one day? How do you say, "Don't worry, our security is not endangered?" Secondly, I will put another question to the hon. Foreign Minister. Even if we have nuclear capability would you also assure the House that you have got nuclear deterrent capability, that you have developed a system of commands, control, communication and intelligence, that you have got a strategic command system, that you have got a credible delivery system? Would you assure the House that you have that? If you don't have that, then we are a non-nuclear power and we shall remain so because when CTBT comes into force and alomost the whole world goes with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, at that time you cannot decide to go on having tests. With increasing globalisation of economy we are going to depend more and more on other powers. And are you going to decide alone that you will carry out your tests? Will you not agree that it is necessary for India to have nuclear deterrent cability We should have nuclear deterrent capability. I emphasise the word 'deterrent'. Only then we can defend ourselves against other interests who are brow-beating us today, be it China, be it America, be it anybody. You are now going to purchase 40 aircraft. The approximate cost is Rs. 7,000 crores. With less than half this money you could have nuclear. You could have gone for Prithvi or Agni. Why

you have not done that? I do not know. The nation has to be assured. The Chinese President has come, he has come with the blessings of the last of the titans of the Chinese revolution. It is true. Yes, he has got a lot of clout in China. He is a very important man. We are all very happy. We have welcomed him. We have made some agreements, no doubt. But the fact remains that, on vital issues between India and China, in spite of improvements, the areas of differences persist, there are unspoken differences that persist. I must inform this august House that I saw on 22 November in a newspaper a very disturbing news-item that in China, the Chinese scientists have been toying with the idea of changing the course of the Brahmaputra river to fertile the North-west area on their side including the Gobi Desert. This news-item has come because former Director of Asian Development Bank, Mr. Jayant Madhva, has written in the Economic Times of 22nd November and he has quoted it form the 'Scientific American' where one Mr. John Horgon has written an article about it. Now, this is the state of affairs. In North-east we have all suffered once in 1962. I tell you that people are very much apprehensive as to what is going to happen in the future. You must assure the nation that things are going okay. My second point is, Madam, a number of speakers have spoken about our immediate neighbours, Bangladesh, Burma, Pakistan, Afghanistan and all that.

7-00 P.M.

True, we must have an excellent relationship with all of them. But that relationship, as I have said, must be in terms of the substantive objectives of our foreign policy—that we must have economic relationships; that we must ensure that our democratic process is strengthened by that relationship and in those countries also, the forces of progress, the forces of liberation and the forces of reform must be strengthened. But this is exactly what is not happening. I will give you one instance. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee spoke about the Ganga waters issue. He said that a new democratic force had emerged and we should welcome it. Yes, we are waiting for the emergence of such a force. Our problem is that...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Dutta, you are making very valid points. But the most important thing is time.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Madam, I would conclude in a couple of minutes.

From Bangladesh, thousands and thousands of people cross our borders for certain reasons. And the External Affairs Minister in New Delhi does not think it necessary to study those reasons and to stop it. As a result of this, we are facing the issue of foreign nationals. Who are handling the issue of foreign nationals? It is being handled by the students' movements, by the extremists and by the underground militants. I have never heard the External Affairs Ministry taking up these issues squarely, boldly and with the imagination to dictate the policy. We are a regional power and we have the right to talk on these issues. Why are we silent? For example on the Chakma issue? One Chief Minister from the North East said so many things. The Chakma problem is Bangladesh's internal problem. But we become the victims. What happened in the Chittagong tracts? It did not happen in other regions. But it has affected of North-East. In Burma, Roheingia Muslims are fleeing Burma. They first enter Bangladesh and from Bangladesh, certain other groups of people enter India.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not Burma. It is Myanmar. Now, Bombay is changed to Mumbai. If we now call it Bombay, some people will be angry.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Yes, Madam. I stand corrected.

But the External Affairs Ministry in India thinks that we should not talk about such issues. There is an assumption that if we talk about them, then some people in India will be angry. I don't

know who those people are. Why should we have such a hastly imagination in our minds that because of some people we cannot talk about them? Madam in order to have an effective foreign policy, any nation has to project itself as a power. Projection of power is a vital instrument of foreign policy. Is India projecting herself as a power? Today India is neither a military power nor an economic power nor a moral power. We are nothing today. Why is it that we are not able to project ourselves as a regional power? We think that it is very wise not to say certain things boldly. Nehru never thought that way. When the Suez Canal was invaded, he said within hours that the act amounted to international gangsterism.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Naked aggression.

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Nehruji termed it as international gangsterism. I remember I was a student at that time. This is how he described the British Prime Minister's action. Today we are very wise. We do not say anything. We keep quiet and smile. Today we are for freedom of speech, for freedom of expression. As Mr. Mukharjee has said, we want democracy to thrive across our borders; we want emancipation of women and we want all these things to happen. Then, are we championing them? Miss Taslima Nasreen, a very powerful writer who has written nothing but truth, truth and truth, has given a graphic description of her society in Bangladesh and has brouht to light certain ailments that afflict Bangladesh and this Sub-continent. Because of that, she had to leave the country. She is having asylum elsewhere. She has applied for visa to visit Inida on the invitation of the Indian Rationalists Association and the Bharat-Bangla Maitri Samiti, for five times. But the Government of India does not have the courage to give her visa. I met the Foreign Minister. I met the hon. Home Minister to find out why she was not being given a visa. The answer is that if she comes to India, then some people in India will be angry. Don't insult the genious of our Muslim brothers and sisters like this.

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: Which Foreign Minister did you meet?

DR. B.B. DUTTA: I gave an application. I wrote a letter to Shri Indrajit Gupta. I wrote to him and the Indian Nationalist Association also wrote to him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Indrajit Gupta is not the Foreign Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dutta, you made a statement that you met the Foreign Minister. He said you didn't meet him. *(Interruptions)*

DR. B.B. DUTTA: Sir, I met you in your chamber along with the Secretary of the Indian Rationalists' Association. You and the Home Secretary, Mr. Padmanabhaiah were there. You told me that the visa was to be granted by the Home Ministry. Then I came to the Home Minister. I have written a letter to him and he has the letter *(Interruptions)*... in the month of August, Miss Nasreen was told by our Embassy people on telephone that there was no change in the policy and she would not be given the visa. I shall stand by it. I can bring my letters. *(Interruptions)* I can submit these before the House.

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री: अगर अभी वीसा मांगा जाए...**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभापति: अभी ऐसे सवाल आप मत कीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**

DR. B.B. DUTTA: What I am trying to say is this. I live in Nehru's India. I live in Gandhi's India. I am not afraid of anybody. People have a right to speak. And if they write the truth, the truth only, and if they write about the forces of progress, should we refuse our hospitality to their coming here for a few days. What is this kind of

India that we are living in? Madam, I tell you...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I think I should tell you, you sit down because...*(Interruptions)* I agree that you are making good points, but still I have my compulsions. *(Interruptions)*

DR. B.B. DUTTA: I will conclude, Madam.

Mr. Mukherjee and others have said that in foreign policy the economic aspect is very important. What is even more important is that the External Affairs Ministry should make its Policy Planning Division functional. It is disfunctional. So, you have researchs about certain regions, about certain countries, and that research is distributed here in this university and that university. What type of funding do they get? What type of research are they doing? After all, it is academic research. Academic research should form an input for operational research. But I challenge the Foregin Minister. Let him say before this House as to how much of operational research is being done, whether in the Policy Planning Division of the External Affairs Ministry or elsewhere. What is being done? There are talks inside the Foreign Affairs Ministry that the Policy Planning Division is a parking place for undesirable officers. The officers who are not wanted elsewhere are dumped here. This is the way in which we are maintaing our Policy Planing Division. This is the research that we do. You study the foreign policies of other countries. They know ten to fifteen years before what is going to happen. For example, why are we not getting admission into the APEC today. Eleven years ago when ASEAN was formed, they were after us. But, at that time, we did not have an idea of the importance the Asia-Pacific region was going to assume economically. Today the Asia-Pacific region has two billion people, 48% of global GDP, 40% of the global trade is being done there and since September, 1991 we are knocking at their door and we haven't yet got the admission! We must be able to anticipate. We have bungled in Myanmar. But I am not going to increase the list further. I tell you that you cannot carry on with your foreign policy without being supported by operational research, which, I think, is completely missing. How much are you spending on research? Let them give the figures, Madam. I challenge them. They have not been spending enough and whatever they are spending is being ill-spent. Thank you, Madam. I conclude now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Today the House has made a new discovery that Mr. Dutta, who mostly keeps quiet in the House, is an expert in foreign policy. With that, we conclude our debate on the Short-Duration Discussion on foregin policy. It is 7.10 now and we have the Railway Minister sitting here for giving clarifications about the train blast. I have to ask the Minister if he can reply tomorrow because there is also a discussion in the Lok Sabha. So, I feel 3'0 clock is okay because in the morning we can't have it since we always have special mentions, etc. and we have legislative business after lunch. Then, we should free you by four as the discussion is taking place at four in the Lok Sabha.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, with this, we conclude and let you go. If you like to sit, you can sit. No problem. I must tell the Members who participated in the debate that the debate is conclude. I would not appreciate any cross-questioning tomorrow because I want structured answers, not broken or piece by piece answers. At least, I don't understand anything out of it. Now, I want to know whether the Members are still in a mood to seek clarifications on the railway accident, or should we call it a day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Let us have it today.